



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# ❖HEBRAICA.❖

---

VOL. VII.

OCTOBER, 1890.

NO. I.

---

## THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION. III. GEN. 37:2-EX. 12:51.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

---

### A. Gen. 37:2-50:26.

The first thirty-six chapters of Genesis have been discussed in previous articles; and no justification has yet been found for the critical hypothesis that the book is compounded from pre-existing documents. We proceed to inquire whether this hypothesis has any better support in the only remaining section of this book, "the generations of Jacob," 37:2-50:26.

### PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

#### 1. The Unity of Plan.

The divisive hypothesis encounters here in full measure the same insuperable difficulty, which meets it throughout the Book of Genesis, and particularly in the life of Abraham and the early history of Jacob. The unity of plan and purpose, which pervades the whole, so that every constituent part has its place and its function and nothing can be severed from it without evident mutilation, positively forbids its being rent asunder in the manner proposed by the critics. If ever a literary product bore upon its face the evidence of its oneness, this is true of the exquisite and touching story of Joseph, which is told with such admirable simplicity and a pathos that is unsurpassed, every incident grouped with the most telling effect, until in the supreme crisis the final disclosure is made. No such high work of art was ever framed by piecing together selected fragments of diverse origin.

The critics tell us that the apparent unity is due to the skill of the redactor. But the suggestion is altogether impracticable. A writer, who gathers his mate-

rials from various sources, may elaborate them in his own mind and so give unity to his composition. But a redactor, who limits himself to piecing together extracts culled from different works by distinct authors varying in conceptions, method and design, can by no possibility produce anything but patchwork, which will betray itself by evident seams, mutilated figures and want of harmony in the pattern. No such incongruities can be detected in the passage before us by the most searching examination. All that the critics affect to discover vanish upon a fair and candid inspection.

Moreover, the story of Joseph, complete as it is in itself is but one link in a uniform and connected chain, and is of the same general pattern with those that precede it. With striking individual diversities both of character and experience the lives of the several patriarchs are, nevertheless, cast in the same general mould. Divine revelations are made to Joseph at the outset, forecasting his future, 37:5sq., as to Abraham, 12:1sq., and to Jacob, 28:11sq. Each was sent away from his paternal home and subjected to a series of trials, issuing both in discipline of character and in ultimate prosperity and exaltation. And the story of Joseph fits precisely into its place in the general scheme, which it is the purpose of Genesis to trace, by which God was preparing and training a people for himself. By a series of marvelous providences, as the writer does not fail to point out, 45:5,7; 50:20, the chosen seed was preserved from extinction and located within the great empire of Egypt, as had been already foreshown to Abraham, 15:13sq., that they might unfold into a nation ready, when the proper time should arrive, to be transplanted into Canaan.

These broad and general features, in which the same constructive mind is discernible throughout, are lost sight of by critics, who occupy themselves with petty details, spying out doublets in every emphatic repetition or in the similar features of distinct events, finding occasions of offence in every transition or digression however natural and appropriate, and creating variance by setting separate parts of the same transaction in antagonism, as though each were exclusive of the other, when in fact they belong together and are perfectly consistent, or by dislocating phrases and paragraphs from their true connection and imposing upon them senses foreign to their obvious intent. These artifices are perpetually resorted to by the critics, and constitute in fact their stock arguments, just because they refuse to apprehend the author's plan, and to judge of the fitness of every particular from his point of view, but insist instead upon estimating everything from some self-devised standard of their own.

Vater, to whom the Pentateuch was a mass of heterogeneous fragments, and who was ready to go to any length in the work of disintegration, nevertheless says\* that the history of Joseph is "a connected whole. To rend it asunder

---

\* *Commentar über d. Pentateuch*, I., p. 290; III., p. 435.

would be to do violence to the narrative." And Tuch, who finds a double narrative throughout the rest of Genesis, declares that it is impossible to do so here. "Several wrong courses have been ventured upon," he says,\* "in respect to the narrator of the life of Joseph. Some relying upon insecure or misunderstood criteria have sought to extort two divergent accounts. Others have held that the documents have been so worked over that it is impracticable to separate them with any degree of certainty. But we must insist upon the close connection of the whole recital, in which one thing carries another along with it, and recognize in that which is continuously written the work of one author." And he adds† respecting ch. 37: "This section in particular has been remarkably maltreated by the divisive document and redactor hypotheses of Ilgen and Gramberg without bringing forth anything but an arbitrary piece of mosaic work, which is shattered by the inner consistency and connection of the passage itself." The posthumous editor of Tuch's Commentary interposes the caveat that "since Hupfeld and Böhmer, the unity of the history of Joseph can no longer be maintained." But the fact is that no inconsistencies have since been pretended in this narrative, which were not already pointed out by Ilgen and Gramberg. Whether the later attempts to establish duplicate accounts have been more successful than those which Tuch so pointedly condemns, we shall inquire presently.

The urgent motive, which impels the most recent critics to split the history of Joseph asunder at all hazards is thus frankly stated by Wellhausen:‡ "The principal source for this last section of Genesis is JE. It is to be presumed that this work is here as elsewhere compounded of J and E. Our previous results urge to this conclusion, and would be seriously shaken if this were not demonstrable. I hold, therefore, that the attempt "to dismember the flowing narrative of Joseph into its sources" is not a mistaken one, but as necessary as the decomposition of Genesis in general."

## 2. Lack of Continuity in the Documents.

If distinct documents have been combined in this portion of Genesis, the critical analysis which disentangles them and restores each to its original separateness, might be expected to bring forth orderly narratives, purged of interpolations and dislocations, with the true connection restored and a consequent gain in each in significance, harmony and clearness. Instead of this there is nothing to show for P, J or E but mutilated fragments, which yield no continuous or intelligible narrative, but require for their explanation and to fill their *lacunae* precisely those passages which the critical process has rent from them. We are expected to assume with no other evidence than that the exigencies of the

---

\* *Commentar über die Genesis*, 2d ed., p. 417.

† *Ibid.*, p. 424.

‡ *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 52.

hypothesis require it, that these P, J and E fragments were originally filled out into as many complete documents, but that the missing parts were removed by R.

### 3. The Divine Names.

The divine names here give no aid in the matter of critical division. Yahweh occurs in but three of these fourteen chapters, and in only eight verses, each time with evident appropriateness. It is found in connection with displays of God's punitive righteousness toward offenders 38:7,10 (no other name of God in the chapter), or his gracious care of Joseph as one of the chosen race, 39:2,3,5,21, 23 (inseparable from the rest of the chapter, where Elohim is found, v. 9), and in a pious ejaculation of the dying patriarch Jacob, 49:18, (in the same discourse with Elohim and Shaddai, v. 25). Hupfeld, *Quellen*, p. 178, confesses the embarrassment, which the critics find from the use of אֱלֹהִים in the history of Joseph in a manner which does not square with their maxims.

### 4. Diction and Style.

Neither is the partition conducted on the basis of such literary criteria as diction and style. Mere scattered scraps are assigned to P, such as can be severed from the main body of the narrative, as entering least into its general flow and texture. The mass of the matter, as has uniformly been the case since ch. 23, is divided between J and E, which by confession of the critics can only be distinguished with the greatest difficulty. At times they are held to be inextricably blended; at other times arbitrary grounds of distinction are invented, such as assigning to E all dreams that are mentioned, or different incidents of the narrative are parcelled between them, as though they were varying accounts of the same thing, whereas they are distinct items in a complete and harmonious whole. Genealogical tables, dates, removals, deaths and legal transactions or ritual enactments are as a rule given to P. Historical narratives are attributed to J and E, and are divided between them not by any definite criteria of style, but by the artifice of imaginary doublets or arbitrary distinctions, leaving numerous breaks and unfilled gaps in their train. The method itself is sufficient to condemn the whole process and to show that the results are altogether factitious. It could be applied with equal plausibility and with like results to any composition, whatever the evidence of its unity.

## SECTION 10. GEN. 37:2-41:57.

### 1. Critical Partition of Chapter 37.

No name of God occurs in this chapter. It has, however, been variously divided, and it affords a good illustration of the ease with which a narrative embracing several incidents can be partitioned at the pleasure of the critic. Knobel,

the latest and most minutely elaborate of the supplementary critics, recognizes in Genesis only an Elohist Primary Document, P, which gives a comparatively trustworthy statement of facts, and a Jehovist Reviser, J, who incorporates with the preceding the legendary embellishments of later times. P's account, vs. 1-4, 23,27,28 (from "and sold," etc.), 31,32a, is that Joseph's reporting his brothers' misdeeds and his father's partiality for him so exasperated his brothers that they threw him into a pit, and then at Judah's instance sold him to Ishmaelites, who took him to Egypt; after this they dip Joseph's coat in blood and send it to their father. J adds from some other authority the prophetic dreams, Joseph's going in quest of his brothers, their conspiring against him, Reuben's proposal not to shed his blood but to put him in a pit (meaning, in the intent of the authority from which he draws, to let him perish there; but by inserting v. 22b, J converts this into a purpose to restore him to his father, and further introduces in the same vein vs. 29,30, Reuben's subsequent distress at not finding Joseph in the pit). J makes no mention of the adoption of Reuben's proposal, but this is to be presumed as Midianites pass, who draw Joseph out of the pit and sell him to Potiphar. Finally Jacob's grief is depicted at the sight of his son's coat, which was sent him.

The reigning critical fashion finds three documents in Genesis, P, J and E, though this chapter is parcelled between J and E, leaving to P only an insignificant fragment at the beginning. Vatke gives the entire chapter to E except one interpolation from J, vs. 25-27, and one clause of v. 28, (and sold . . . silver), which records the sale to the Ishmaelites as proposed by Judah. According to E, Joseph was carried off by the Midianites, who chanced to find him in the pit into which his brothers had thrown him. It does not appear from J that Joseph was ever put in a pit at all. So also Gramberg views the case from his peculiar division of the chapter, connecting v. 25 directly with v. 23; the brothers dissemble their spite against Joseph and sit down to their food, when they spy the Ishmaelites coming and resolve to sell him to them. Schrader enlarges the interpolation from J by vs. 23,24,31-35 with the effect of transferring the statement of Joseph's being put in the pit and of his father's grief from E to J. This still leaves the whole of the narrative prior to v. 23 with E, and nothing in J respecting the relation of Joseph to his brothers until suddenly, without a word of explanation, they are found deliberating whether to kill him or to sell him as a slave.

Wellhausen is too acute a critic and too ingenious in discovering doublets to suffer this state of affairs to continue. He remarks, *Comp. d. Hex.*, p. 53: "Verses 12-24 are preparatory to vs. 25sq., and are indispensable for both E and J. To be sure no certain conclusion can be drawn from this alone as to its composite character, but a presumption is created in its favor which is confirmed by actual traces of its being double." Acting upon this presumption he sets him-

self to work to discover the traces. It seems to him that "Here am I" is not the proper answer to what Israel says to Joseph, v. 13; and that v. 18 does not fit in between vs. 17 and 19. "They saw him afar off" implies that he had not yet "found them;" and "they conspired against him to slay him" is a parallel to v. 20. Verses 21 and 22 are also doublets, only instead of "Reuben" in v. 21 we should read "Judah," whose proposal is to cast him into the pit, v. 20, to perish without killing him themselves, while Reuben, v. 22, has the secret purpose of rescuing him. From these premises he concludes that while J is the principal narrator in this paragraph, as shown by Israel, v. 13, Hebron v. 14, and verbal suffixes *passim*, nevertheless 13b, 14a, 18, 22 and parts of vs. 23, 24, in which **אתו** repeatedly occurs instead of a suffix attached to the verb, belong to E and represent his parallel narrative.

In vs. 2b-11 he is less successful in discovering traces of twofold authorship. These verses are attributed to E, who deals more largely with dreams than J, and who, moreover, has **בן זקנים**, v. 3 as 21:2 against **ילד זקנים** 44:20 J; **כתנת פסים**, v. 3, as vs. 23, 32 against **כתנת** J, and especially has **אתו** constantly, vs. 4, 5, 8, 9, instead of a verbal suffix in marked contrast with vs. 12sq. "With the sons of Bilhah," etc., v. 2, does not accord accurately with the preceding clause, and "he told it to his father and to his brethren," v. 10, deviates from the statement in v. 9; but he thinks these to be additions by a later hand and not from J. He has, however, one resource; vs. 19, 20, J, speak of Joseph's dreams, consequently J must have given some account of them, though it has not been preserved.

Dillmann proves in this instance to have had sharper eyes than Wellhausen, and has found the desired doublets where the latter could discover none. To be sure he unceremoniously sets aside Wellhausen's criteria. He gives vs. 19, 20 to E (not J) in spite of repeated verbal suffixes which he will not recognize here as a discriminating mark, in spite, too, of **הליקה** which occurs 24:65 J, and nowhere else in the O. T.; and accordingly he does not allow the inference that J gave a parallel account of the dreams. But the coveted parallel is found by setting vs. 3, 4 as J's explanation of the hatred of Joseph over against that of E in vs. 5-11. According to J, his brothers hated him because he was his father's favorite; according to E, because of his ambitious dreams.\* J says "they hated him," v. 4 **וירשנו**; E, "they envied him," v. 11 **וירקנו**. To be sure **שנא** occurs twice over in the E paragraph, vs. 5, 8, and with explicit reference to v. 4, clearly indicating the identity of the writer. But if any one imagines that such a trifle as this can disturb a critic's conclu-

---

\* Dillmann explains the allusion to Joseph's mother, 37:10, whose death is mentioned, 35:19, by his favorite method of transposition, assuming that the statement of her death in E really occurred after this time, but R for the sake of harmonizing with P, inserted it sooner. But it remains to be shown that Leah could not be referred to in this manner after Rachel's death.

sions, he is much mistaken. Dillmann blandly says that the unwelcome clauses were inserted by R, and lo! they disappear at once. The word of a critic is equal to the wand of a magician. When he says that v. 5b is inappropriate where it stands because the actual recital of the dream follows, vs. 6,7, Delitzsch reminds him that such anticipatory announcements are quite usual, and cites 2:8. He says the same of v. 8b, because only one dream had yet been told, forgetting the numerous examples of the generic use of the plural.\* כְּהֵנָּה and בְּנֵי זִקְנִים פְּסִים, v. 3, which Wellhausen adduces as characteristic of E, become with Dillmann indicative of J. Knobel remarks that v. 7 and 26:12 are the only two passages in the Pentateuch, in which the patriarchs are spoken of as cultivating the soil or otherwise than as nomads; they should therefore be ascribed to the same hand. The critics lay stress upon a point like this when it suits them; otherwise they quietly ignore it. Dillmann gives v. 7 to E; 26:12 to J.

Dillmann further finds a foothold for J in v. 2, by insisting that 2a and 2b are mutually exclusive and that the former should be given to P or E, and the latter to J. Delitzsch cannot see why in point of matter they may not have proceeded from the same pen, while in grammatical construction Gen. 1:2,3 offers a precise parallel.

Critics are divided in opinion as to the share which is to be allowed P in 37:2. By common consent they assign him the initial words "These are the generations of Jacob," i. e., an account of Jacob's family from the time of his father's death; and thus we have a P title to a J and E section. The majority also refer to him the following clause, "Joseph was seventeen years old," with or without the rest of the sentence, which then becomes utterly unmeaning and is out of connection with anything whatever. The only reason for thus destroying its sense by severing it from the narrative to which it belongs is the critical assumption that all dates must be attributed to P. But Nöldeke himself revolts at the rigorous enforcement of this rule. He says,† "The mention of the youthful age of Joseph suits very well in the whole connection as well as that of his manly age, Gen. 41:46, and of the advanced age which he attained, Gen. 50:26. These numbers also have no connection whatever with the chronological system of the Primary Document (P) any more than the twenty years' abode in Mesopotamia," Gen. 31:38,41.

It will not be necessary to proceed with the recital of the varying divisions of Kuenen, Kittell and Kautzsch, which are sufficiently indicated, p. 2.‡ The critics themselves have shown how variously the same narrative may be divided. And it must be a very intractable material indeed that can resist the persistent application of such methods as the critics freely employ. The fact that different

\* Cf. Gen. 8:4; 13:12; 21:7; Num. 26:8; Judg. 12:7; 1 Sam. 17:43; Job 17:1.

† *Untersuchungen zur Kritik d. Alt. Test.*, p. 32.

‡ References not otherwise specified are to previous numbers of HEBRAICA.



versions of a story can be constructed out of a narrative by an ingenious partition of its constituent elements by no means proves its composite character. They may be purely subjective, destitute of any historical basis, and of no more value than any clever trick at cross-reading.

It is alleged, however, that there are certain glaring inconsistencies in this chapter, which cannot be otherwise accounted for than as the fusing together of discordant narratives. Four discrepancies are charged.

1. Verses 21,22 it was Reuben, but v. 26 it was Judah, who persuaded the brothers not to put Joseph to death.

2. Verses 25,27,28, 39:1, Ishmaelites, but vs. 28,36, Midianites took Joseph and brought him to Egypt.

3. According to different clauses of v. 28, Joseph was carried off secretly without the knowledge of his brothers, or was sold by them.

4. Verse 36, he was sold to Potiphar, but 39:1 (purged of interpolations), to an unnamed Egyptian.

These imaginary difficulties are of easy solution.

As to the first. It surely is not surprising that two of the brothers should have taken an active part in the consultations respecting Joseph, nor that the same two should be prominent in the subsequent course of the transactions. Reuben, as the eldest, had special responsibilities and would naturally be forward to express his mind: while Judah's superior force of character, like that of Peter among the apostles, made him prompt to take the lead, and there is no inconsistency in what is attributed to them. Reuben persuaded them not to kill Joseph but to cast him alive into a pit, cherishing the purpose, which he did not divulge to them, to restore him to his father. They accede to his proposal intending to let Joseph die in the pit or to kill him at some future time. To this state of mind Judah addresses himself, v. 26. The absence of Reuben, when Joseph was sold, is not expressly stated, but is plainly enough implied in his despair and grief at his brother's disappearance. The reply which his brothers made is not recorded; but there is no implication that they were as ignorant as he of what had become of Joseph. That they had a guilt in the matter which he did not share is distinctly intimated, 42:22; he must, therefore, have been fully aware that they did something more than put Joseph in the pit at his suggestion.

As to the second point. Ishmaelites in the strict and proper sense were a distinct tribe from Midianites, and were of different though related origin. It is, however, a familiar fact, which we have had occasion to observe before, that tribal names are not always used with definite exactness, VI., p. 208. And there is explicit evidence that Ishmaelites was used in a wide sense to include Midianites, Judg. 8:24, cf. 7:1sq; 8:1sq. Dillmann's objection that this belonged to a later period comes with a bad grace from one who places the earliest Pentateuchal documents centuries after Gideon. The absence of the article before Midian-

ites, v. 28, does not imply that they were distinct from the Ishmaelites before perceived, vs. 25,27. They were recognized in the distance as an Ishmaelite caravan, but it was not till they actually came up to them that the Ishmaelites were discovered to be specifically Midianites.

As to the third point. If the first half of v. 28 were severed from its connection the words might mean that Midianites drew Joseph out of the pit. But in the connection in which it stands, such a sense is simply impossible. And the suggestion that R had two statements before him; one, that Midianites drew Joseph out of the pit without his brothers' knowledge and carried him off to Egypt; the other, that the brothers drew him from the pit and sold him to the Ishmaelites; is to charge him with inconceivable stupidity or reckless falsification. There can be no manner of doubt how the author of the book in its present form understood the transaction. There is no possible suggestion of more than one meaning in the words before us. The invention of another sense may illustrate the critic's wit, but it has no more merit than any other perversion of an author's obvious meaning. And it derives no warrant from 40:15; Joseph was "stolen away" even though his captors bought him from those who had no right to dispose of him.

The fourth point can be best considered when we come to ch. 39.

## 2. Chapter 38.

Because the narrative of Joseph is interrupted by ch. 38, De Wette\* inferred "that we have here a compilation, not a continuous history by one narrator." The charge of displacement has been regularly repeated ever since,† though obviously unfounded. Chapter 38 is entirely germane to the subject treated, and it belongs precisely where it is in the author's plan. He is professedly giving an account of "the generations of Jacob," 37:2, not the life of Joseph simply, but the history of Jacob's family. Joseph is necessarily thrown into prominence since the events which brought about the removal of the chosen race to Egypt were so largely connected with him. But the incidents of this chapter have their importance in the constitution of Jacob's family at the time of the migration to Egypt, 46:12, and in the permanent tribal arrangements of Israel, Num. 26:19sq. The writer conducts Joseph to Egypt, where he is sold as a slave. There he leaves him for a while until these facts in Judah's family are related, when he resumes the thread of Joseph's narrative precisely where he left off and proceeds as before. It is just the method that the best writers pursue in similar circumstances. So far from suggesting confusion or disarrangement, it argues an orderly well-considered plan.

---

\* *Beiträge*, II., p. 146.

† Page 2, note †; p. 3, note \*; p. 4, note §; p. 6, 5. 1).

The chronological objection is equally futile. If Judah's marriage occurred shortly after Joseph was sold, as is expressly stated, there is no reason why all that is recorded in this chapter may not have taken place within the twenty-two years which preceded the migration to Egypt. It implies early marriages on the part of his sons but not incredibly early.

A further objection is thus stated, p. 6: "It is not to be overlooked that according to this chapter, the custom of the Levirate is very old, antedating by centuries the law recorded in Deuteronomy; P would not have been guilty of such an anachronism." Where, it may be asked, is the proof that there is an anachronism? Genesis shows that in several respects the laws of Moses embodied or were based upon patriarchal usages; while, nevertheless, the modifications show that there has been no transference to a primitive period of the customs of a later time. The penalty which Tamar was threatened, was not that of the Mosaic law, in which Dillmann admits a reminiscence of anteleagal times. The critics claim that the Deuteronomic law belongs to the reign of Josiah, yet the Levirate was an established institution in the days of the judges, Ruth, 4:10. How much the argument from silence, of which critics make so frequent use, amounts to in this case, may be inferred from the fact that such marriages, though their existence is trebly vouched for, are nowhere alluded to in the other Pentateuchal codes nor in the later history until the times of the New Testament, Matt. 22:14. It is gratifying to note the admission that P would not commit an anachronism. He is not mistaken then, in speaking of circumcision in the family of Abraham as opposed to any critical inferences, V., p. 250, "that its existence as a custom would seem to date from Moses' days," nor in assigning the Levitical law to the wanderings in the wilderness, nor in his detailed description of the sacred tabernacle which cannot be the reflection from the temple of Solomon thrown back upon the Mosaic age.

The suggestion, p. 3, note, that the "general purpose of this chapter is to indicate the origin of the house of David" assumes that the writer adopted a very unusual method of flattering the pride of a royal house. How displeasing it was to national vanity appears from the fact that the Targum converts Judah's wife from the daughter of a Canaanite to that of a merchant and later legends make Tamar a daughter of Melchizedek.

### 3. Chapter 39.

The critical partition is here rested partly on the ground of alleged discrepancies, partly on that of diction. It is said that there are varying representations of the purchaser of Joseph. Was he, 37:36, Potiphar, the eunuch of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, or was he simply an Egyptian, whose name and official position, if he had any, are unknown? He is nowhere called Potiphar in this chapter except in v. 1, but only Joseph's master, v. 3, his Egyptian master, v. 2,

or the Egyptian, v. 5. And nothing is said, outside of v. 1, of his standing in any special relation to Pharaoh or holding any office under the king; but mention is made of "all that he had in the house and in the field," implying that he was the owner of a landed estate. It is hence inferred that the words "Potiphar, the eunuch of Pharaoh, captain of the guard," do not properly belong to v. 1, but were inserted by R to make it correspond with 37:36; and that originally it simply read "an Egyptian," words which would be superfluous, if his name and title had previously been given. But neither does "Potiphar" occur in ch. 40, where the critics admit that he is intended by Joseph's master, v. 7, see also vs. 3,4. Royal body guards are not always composed of native troops, so that it may not have been a matter of course that their captain was an Egyptian. Knobel thinks that the statement is made in contrast with the Hyksos origin of the monarch. Or it may emphasize the fact that Joseph was not only a slave but a slave of a foreigner; the Hebrew servant, vs. 14,17, had an Egyptian master. But no special reason is needed to justify the expression. Goliath "from Gath from the ranks of the Philistines" is further called "the Philistine," 1 Sam. 17:23, and throughout the chapter is always denominated "the Philistine," without repeating his name. That Potiphar was married creates no real difficulty. It is a disputed point whether סרִיס is invariably to be taken in the strict sense of eunuch or may sometimes have the general meaning of officer. However this may be, Winer\* refers to Chardin, Niebuhr and Burckhardt in proof of the statement that "even in the modern orient eunuchs have sometimes kept a harem of their own." There is positively no ground, therefore, for assuming an interpolation in v. 1. And the explicit statement of that verse annuls the critical allegation of variant stories respecting the person of Joseph's master.

It is further said that Joseph's master is in 39:20,21 distinguished from the keeper of the prison into which Joseph was put; whereas in 40:3,4,7 they are identical. But the confusion here charged upon the text lies solely in the mind of the interpreters. The narrative is perfectly clear and consistent. The prison was in the house of Joseph's master, 40:7, the captain of the guard, v. 3, who had supreme control over it, v. 4; and this corresponds exactly with the representation, 39:20. Under him there was a subordinate keeper charged with its immediate oversight, 39:21, who was so favorably disposed towards Joseph that he committed all the prisoners into his hands and let him manage everything in the prison. This is neither identical with nor contradictory to the statement, 40:4, that the captain of the guard appointed Joseph to attend upon two prisoners of rank from the royal household. It has been said that he waited upon them simply as Potiphar's servant, and that ch. 40, E, knows nothing of Joseph's imprisonment related by J, ch. 39, and moreover uses the term מִשְׁמָר *ward*, 40:3,4,

---

\* *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, Art. *Verschnittene*.

J, so 41:10 instead of **בית הסהר** *prison*, 39:20-23. But this result is only reached by expunging from the text without the slightest warrant every clause which directly declares the opposite, 40:3b,5b,15b; 41:14; cf. 39:20.

Wellhausen parcels the chapter between J and E, giving vs. 1-5,20-23 to the former on account of the repeated occurrence of **יהוה**, and vs. 6-19 to the latter because of **אלהים**, v. 9, (though this is the ordinary usage when Gentiles speak or are spoken to), and certain other expressions alleged to be characteristic of E. The result is that Joseph is in E falsely accused of a gross crime, but there is no intimation how the matter issues; and in J his master, who had the greatest confidence in him and was richly blessed for his sake, puts him in prison for no cause whatever. Wellhausen, moreover, finds traces of E in the J sections and of J in the E section. Dillmann admits the indivisible character of the chapter and refers the whole of it to J, but as the two following chapters are given to E, the consequence is that according to J, Joseph is put in prison and no information given how or why he was subsequently released; the next that we hear of him he is made viceroy of Egypt with no explanation of how it came to pass, see p. 10 (8) "How J brings Joseph before Pharaoh is not clear." The expressions commonly attributed to E, which are found in this chapter, are accounted for by Dillmann as insertions by R. This repeated occurrence of traces of one document in the limits of the other, and the allegation that the documents have been in various particulars modified by R, are simply confessions that the text is not what by the critics' hypothesis it ought to be. Words and phrases held to be characteristic of J or E in one place are perversely found in the wrong document in another place. So without revising and correcting their own previous conclusions and adjusting their hypothesis to the phenomena as they find them, the critics insist that the document itself is wrong, and who can there be to blame for it but R?

The following expressions regarded as characteristic of E, nevertheless occur in the J text of this chapter :

<p>Verse 4, <b>וְיִשְׂרָאֵל</b> as 40:4; Ex. 24:13; 33:11, repeatedly also in P; v. 6, <b>יִפְהַתָּאֵר וְיִפְהַ מְרָאָה</b> as 29:17; v. 7, <b>וְיִהְיֶה אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה</b> as 15:1; 22:1; 40:1; 48:1; v. 21, <b>וְיִתֵּן חֲנוּ בְעֵינַי</b> as Ex. 3:21; 11:3. Varying constructions as <b>הַפְּקִיד</b></p>	<p>in vs. 4,5, and of <b>מַצְלִיחַ</b> trans. v. 2, but intrans. vs. 3,23 would be held to indicate different writers if they occurred in distinct sections. The diffuseness in v. 1, vs. 2-6, vs. 21-23 is such as is elsewhere claimed to be a mark of P.</p>
---	---

#### 4. Chapter 40.

This chapter and the two that follow are by the critics referred to E. Dillmann gives the following reasons in the case of ch. 40: "the dreams," but it is arbitrarily assumed that all dreams must belong to E, see VI., p. 171; "vs. 3a,4 presuppose Joseph not in prison as ch. 39, but the slave of the captain of the guard as 37:36; 41:12." Nothing is said or implied at variance with his imprisonment, which is explicitly affirmed, vs. 3b,15b. "I was stolen away," v. 15,

is not inconsistent with his being sold by his brothers; "the connection of ch. 41 with 40," is readily conceded, but involves no discrepancy with or separation from ch. 39. He offers no argument from language but "the avoidance of the verbal suffix, which distinguishes E from J," quietly ignoring the fact that he refused to admit this criterion in ch. 37. **אלהים** v. 8, is spoken to Gentiles; "and it came to pass after these things" cannot be claimed for E, 40:1, after having been given to J, 39:7. That vs. 1,5 have "the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt," while the rest of the chapter has "chief butler," "chief baker" and "Pharaoh," is no good reason for affirming that the former are insertions by R, when v. 1 is indispensable as supplying the reason for v. 2, and the office of the chief butler is simply called "butlership" **משקה**, v. 21. It can scarcely be thought that such arguments are of any weight in favor of critical division.

Nor is there an anachronism in the phrase "land of the Hebrews," v. 15. "Abram the Hebrew," was the head of a powerful clan, 14:13,14, recognized as such by native tribes of Canaan, 23:6, and his friendship sought by the king of the Philistines, 21:22sq. Isaac's greatness is similarly described, 26:13sq., 28sq. The prince and the people of Shechem were willing to submit to circumcision for the sake of friendly intercourse and trade with Jacob, and Jacob's sons avenged the wrong done their sister by the destruction of the city, ch. 34. The Hebrews had been in Canaan for two centuries and their presence was influential and widely known. There is nothing strange, therefore, in the fact that Potiphar's wife calls Joseph a Hebrew, 39:14,17, or that he could speak of the country whence he came as the land of the Hebrews.

### 5. Chapter 41.

The reasons alleged by Dillmann for assigning this chapter to E are the significant dreams which are of no more weight than those in ch. 40. Joseph is called "servant to the captain of the guard," v. 12, but he was also a prisoner, v. 14, which is evaded after the usual critical fashion, by erasing from the text the words "and they brought him hastily out of the dungeon" as an insertion from a hypothetical parallel of J; but even then his shaving himself and changing his raiment are an allusion to his prison attire, or why are not the same things mentioned when others are presented before the king? The references to ch. 40 (41:10-13, cf. 40:1sq.; 41:16, cf. 40:8), and unusual words common to both chapters (**פֶּתֶרֶן**, **פֶּתֶרֶן**, **בֵּן** station, **קֶצֶף**) point to the same author, but in no way imply that he was not the author of ch. 39 and 43 as well; **אלהים** in vs. 16,25,32,38,39 is in language addressed to Pharaoh or used by him; vs. 51,52 are the only instances in which **יהוה** could with any propriety be substituted for it, and even there **אלהים** is equally appropriate, for the reference is to God's providential blessings, such as men in general may share rather than to specific favor granted to one of the chosen race; **בלערי**, vs. 16,44, but once beside in Genesis,

14:24, referred by Dillmann to E, but by the majority of critics to an independent source, and twice more in the Hex., Num. 5:20; Josh. 22:19, P. The arguments for considering this chapter a part of the document E are accordingly lame and impotent enough.

We are further informed that this chapter is not a unit as it stands. It is essential for the critics to establish, if possible, the existence of a parallel narrative by J, which may have filled the gap in that document between Joseph's imprisonment and his elevation. Accordingly stress is laid upon some slight verbal changes in repeating Pharaoh's dreams, especially the words added to the description of the lean kine, v. 19, "such as I never saw in all the land of Egypt for badness," and v. 21, "when they had eaten up the fat kine, it could not be known that they had eaten them; but they were still illflavored as at the beginning." And a vigorous search is made for so-called doublets. Wherever the writer does not content himself with a bald and meagre statement of what he is recording, but feels impelled to enlarge and dwell upon it in order to give his thought more adequate expression, the amplifications or repetitions which he employs are seized upon as though they were extraneous additions imported into E's original narrative by R from an imaginary parallel account by J, just as a like fulness of expression in other passages is at the pleasure of the critics declared to be indicative of the verbose and repetitious style of P.

The dreams vs. 2-7 are repeated, vs. 18-24 in almost identical terms, only in a very few instances equivalent expressions are employed, viz.: תָּאָר v. 18sq. for כִּרְאָה v. 2sq. (but see 29:17 E, 39:6 J); רָק v. 19 for רָק v. 3; כָּלָא v. 22 for כִּרְאָה v. 5 (but see v. 7). The alleged doublets are, v. 31, parallel to v. 30b; v. 34 יַעֲשֶׂה to יִפְקֹד; 35b to 35a; vs. 41,43b,44 to v. 40 (Joseph's rule is stated four times, so that repetition cannot be escaped by parcelling it between E and J); v. 49 to v. 48; vs. 55,56a to 54b (the universality of the famine repeated three times including 57b). While it is claimed

that these indicate two narrators, Dillmann admits that there are no criteria by which to distinguish which is E and which J. The further occurrence of words in this chapter which according to critical rules should belong to P, e. g., חֲרָטָם vs. 8,24 in the Pentateuch besides only Ex. 7:11,22; 8:3,14,15; 9:11, all P; פָּקֶדוֹן in O. T. besides only Lev. 5:21,23, P; קָמַץ v. 47 in O. T. besides only Lev. 2:2; 5:12; 6:8, and the corresponding verb only Lev. 2:2; 5:12; Num. 5:26, all P, leads one to doubt the value of criteria in other cases which the critics can thus disregard at pleasure.

On the whole, then, the critical partition of chs. 37-41 rests upon alleged inconsistencies in the narrative which plainly do not exist as the text now stands, but which the critics themselves create by arbitrary erasures and forced interpretations. The literary proof offered of the existence of different documents is of the scantiest kind. There are no indications of varying diction of any account. And the attempt to bridge the chasms in the documents by means of a supposed parallel narrative, from which snatches have been preserved by R, attributes an unaccountable procedure to him, and falls to pieces at once upon examination.

There are three staple arguments, by which the critics attempt to show that there was in the sources, from which R is conjectured to have drawn, a second

narrative parallel to that in the existing text. Each of them is built upon a state of facts antagonistic to the hypothesis, which they ingeniously seek to wrest in its favor by assuming the truth of the very thing to be proved.

1. Facts, which are essential to the narrative, could not, it is said, have failed to appear in either document; it must be presumed, therefore, that each narrator recorded them.

But the perpetual recurrence of such serious gaps in the so-called documents, which the critics are by every device laboring to construct, tends rather to show that no such documents ever really had any separate existence. That these gaps are due to omissions by R is pure assumption with no foundation but the unproved hypothesis which it is adduced to support; an assumption, moreover, at variance with the conduct repeatedly attributed to R in other places, where to relieve other complications of the hypothesis he is supposed to have scrupulously preserved unimportant details from one of his sources, even though they were superfluous repetitions of what had already been extracted from another.

2. When words and phrases, which the critics regard as characteristic of one document, are found, as they frequently are, in sections which they assign to the other, it is claimed that R has mixed the texts of the different documents.

But the obvious and natural conclusion from the fact referred to is, that what are affirmed to be characteristic words of different documents, are freely used by the same writer. The allegation that R had anything to do with the matter, is an assumption which has no other basis than the hypothesis which it is brought to support. It is plain that any conceit whatever could be carried through successfully, if every deviation from its requirements was sufficiently explained by referring it to R.

3. Whenever a thought is repeated or dwelt upon for the sake of giving it more emphatic expression, the critics scent a doublet, affirming that R has appended to the statement in one document the corresponding statement contained in the other.

But here again the agency of R is pure assumption based on the hypothesis in whose interest it is alleged. That a writer should use more amplitude and fullness in describing matters of special moment is quite intelligible. But why a compiler like R should encumber the narrative by reduplicating what he has already drawn from one source by the equivalent language of another, or why, if this is his method in the instances adduced, he does not consistently pursue it in others, it does not appear.

What are so confidently paraded as traces or indications of some missing portion of a critical document are accordingly rather to be esteemed indications that the documents of the critics are a chimera.



## 1. LANGUAGE OF P.\*

## OLD WORDS.

(1) אלה תלדות see V., p. 152.

The following words not in the list VI., p. 2, might with propriety have been urged as belonging to P by critical rules.

דָּבָה, 37:2, only besides in Hex., Num. 13:32; 14:36, 37 P.

דָּבָר, with acc. pers., 37:4, only besides Num. 26:3 P.

שָׁעִיר עֲזִים, 37:31, only besides in Hex. in the ritual law, where it occurs repeatedly, Lev. 4:23; 9:3; 16:5; 23:9; Num. chs. 7, 15, 28, 29; nowhere else in O. T., except Ezek. 43:22; 45:23, where it is borrowed from the Penta-teuch.

41:50 has the same fulness of expression which in 16:15; 21:3 is said to be a mark of P.

## 2. LANGUAGE OF J.\*

## OLD WORDS.

(1) עֵינַיִם נִשָּׂא explained above under Section 5, Language of J. (2) בָּשָׂר (=relative) Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (3) וְתָהָר V., p. 155, (35). (4) יָסָר Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (5) רַע בְּעֵינַי Sect. 6, Lang. of E. (6) לְבַלְתִּי V., p. 155. (7) הִבֵּה Sect. 4, Lang. of J. (8) נָא Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (9) הָיוּהוּ see Preliminary Remarks, No. 3. (10) גָּדִי Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (11) צִעִיף Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (12) אִיהָ V., p. 155. (13) כִּי-עַל-כֵּן always referred to J. (14) פָּן V., p. 155. (15) אֲנֹכִי repeatedly in both J and E and once in P, V., p. 174, 6:17. (16) פָּרִץ Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (17) מִצְלִיחַ Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (18) מִצָּא V., p. 175, 6:5-8. (19) בָּנָלִי Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (20) חָרָה Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (21) חֲשֵׁב 15:6; 38:15 J; 31:15; 50:20; Num. 23:9 E; Lev. 7:18; 17:4; 25:27, 31, 50, 52; 27:18, 23; Num. 18:27, 30 P, besides occurring frequently in P in a derived sense. (22) חָשַׁךְ 39:9 J; 20:6; 22:12 E; 22:16 R; all in Hex. (23) יָפָה-מְרֹאֶה 12:11; 39:6 J; 29:17; 41:2, 4 E; all in Hex. (24) תַּפֹּשׁ 4:21 J; 39:12; Josh. 8:8, 23 J; Num. 5:13; 31:27 P; all in Hex. except Deuteronomy.

## NEW WORDS.

(1) טָרַף 37:33<sup>bis</sup>; 44:28<sup>bis</sup>; 49:27 J; Ex. 22:12 E. Derivatives טָרַף adj., Gen. 8:11 J; טָרַף (poetic) Gen. 49:9 J; Num. 23:24 E; טָרַפָּה

Gen. 31:39; Ex. 22:12, 30 E; Lev. 7:24; 17:15; 22:8 P.

(2) נָכַר H1. recognize, 37:32, 33; 38:25, 26 J; 27:23; 31:32; Deut. 33:9 E; 42:7, 8<sup>bis</sup>, the critics give v. 7 to J, v. 8 to E.

## RARE AND POETIC WORDS.

Words that a writer scarcely ever uses afford of course no indication of his ordinary style.

(1) נִטָּה עַד 38:1 this construction does not occur again in O. T.

(2) פֶּתַח עֵינַיִם 38:14; the "entrance to Enaim" does not chance to be spoken of elsewhere, but פֶּתַח is of repeated occurrence in J, E and P; it is used precisely as here, Josh. 20:4 P.

(3) הִתְעַלֶּף 38:14; nowhere else in O. T. in this sense.

(4) עֲרֹבֹן 38:17, 18, 20; nowhere else in O. T.

(5) בֵּית הַחֹהֵר 39:20, 21, 22, 23 J; 40:3, 5 claimed to be insertions from J in an E context; nowhere else in O. T.

(6) הִתְנַכַּל 37:18; nowhere else in Hex.; the Pī'el occurs Num. 25:18 P.

(7) אֶרְחָה 37:25; nowhere else in Hex.

(8) וְנוֹנִים 38:24; nowhere else in Hex.

(9) בָּצַע 37:26 J; Ex. 18:21 E; all in Hex.

(10) קָרְשָׁה 38:21<sup>bis</sup>, 22; all in Hex. except Deut. 23:18.

## 3. LANGUAGE OF E.\*

## OLD WORDS.

How utterly the critics have failed to make out a separate diction for E appears from the fact that every one of these words with a solitary exception occurs likewise in J or P: and

the great majority of them have been previously adduced as characteristic of J.

(1) חָלוּם is by rule referred to E, yet it occurs Num. 12:6 J (according to Dillmann) Sect. 6, Lang. of E. (2) נָא see Lang. of J (immedi-

\* The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, Vol. VI., No. 1, and the following references are to explanations already made.

ately preceding) No. 8. (3) אָנְכִי Lang. of J, No. 15. (4) טָרַם V., p. 155, Lang. of J. (5) שָׁלַח יד 37:19 E; 24:65 J; all in O. T. (6) הָלוּהוּ Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (7) אֱלֹהִים see Preliminary Remarks, No. 3. (8) כְּרוֹעַ Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (9) שִׁים V., p. 154, Lang. of J; שִׁית 41:33; 46:4 E; 3:15; 4:25; 30:40; 48:14,17, J, all in Genesis; besides other passages it is found in Ex. 7:23, which Dillmann refers to E, Jülicher to J, and Wellhausen to P. (10) בִּלְעָרִי 41:16, 44 E; 14:24 E (Dillmann), but other critics an independent source; Num. 5:20; Josh. 22:19 P. (11) בַּתְּחִלָּה Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (12) רָק Sect. 3, Lang. of J, 6:5-8. (13) כַּחֲזוֹל הֵים 41:49 E section, though Kautzsch and others cut out this clause and give it to J; 22:17 R or J; 32:13 J; Josh. 11:4 D; all in Hex. (14) חָרַל 23:5; 41:49 E; 11:8; 18:11; Ex. 9:29,33,34; 14:12 J; Num. 9:13 P. (15) תַּעֲרָה 20:13; 21:14; 37:15; Ex. 23:4, Sect. 6, Lang. of E. Absolutely the only one in this entire number, which happens not to be found in any but an E section. (16) אִיפֹה 37:16 E, nowhere else so spelled in Hex., as אִפּוֹה see Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (17) יַפֵּת מְרֵאָה 29:17; 41:2,4 E; 12:11; 39:16 J. (18) פָּעִים V., p. 155, Lang. of J; פְּעָמִים in Hex. only 27:36; 43:10 J; Num. 20:11 E, where Dillmann suspects that it was inserted by R.

## NEW WORDS.

- (1) כִּקֵּשׁ 31:39; 37:15,16; Ex. 10:11; 33:7 E; 43:9,30; Ex. 2:15; 4:24 J; Ex. 4:19 J (Dillmann), E (Wellhausen); Josh. 2:22 JE; Josh. 22:23 R; Lev. 19:31; Num. 16:10; 35:23 P.
- (2) מִרְחוּק 22:4; 37:18; Ex. 2:4; 20:21; 24:1 E; Ex. 20:18 J (Dillmann).
- (3) הִצִּיל 31:9,16; 37:22; Ex. 3:8; 5:23; 18:4,8, 9,10b; Josh. 9:26; 24:10 E; 32:12; 37:21; Ex. 2:19; 12:27 J; Josh. 2:13 JE; Ex. 6:6; Num. 35:25; Josh. 22:31 P.

- (4) כָּאֵן Ex. 22:16b; Num. 20:21; 22:13,14 E; Gen. 37:35; 39:8; 48:19; Ex. 4:23; 7:14; 10:3; 16:28 J; adjective, Ex. 7:27; 9:2; 10:4 J.
- (5) שָׁאֵל 37:35; 42:38; 44:29,31; Num. 16:30, 33 J.
- (6) קָרִים 41:6,23,27 E; Ex. 10:13b; 14:21 J.
- (7) עָמַל 41:51 E; Num. 23:21 E (Dillmann), J (Wellhausen).
- (8) שֹׁבֵר *trade* in grain, 41:56,57; 43:2,3,5,10 E; 42:6,7; 43:24,20,22; 44:25; 47:14 J.
- (9) נִכְוֵן 41:32; Ex. 8:22; 19:11,15 E; Ex. 34:2; Josh. 8:4 J.
- (10) אֲשַׁכֵּל 40:10; Num. 13:23,24 E; Deut. 32:32 J.

## RARE AND POETIC WORDS.

- (1) פִּתְרוֹן 40:5,8,12,18; 41:11 E; all in O. T.
- (2) שֹׁחַט 40:11 E; all in O. T.
- (3) צִנְמוֹת 41:23 E; all in O. T.
- (4) חֲמֹשׁ 41:34 E; all in O. T.
- (5) אֲכָרַךְ 41:43 E; all in O. T.
- (6) קָמִץ 41:47 E; so Fuerst, but according to Gesen. קָמִץ, Lev. 2:2; 5:12; 6:8 P, from קָמִץ, Lev. 2:2; 5:12; Num. 5:26 P.
- (7) אָלֵם *bind* 37:7 E; אֶלְמָה 37:7 (four times) all in Hex.
- (8) אָחוּ 41:2,18 E; all in Hex.
- (9) יָעַר 40:6 E; all in Hex.
- (10) שָׁרִיג 40:10,12; all in Hex.
- (11) בֵּן *post* 40:13; 41:13 E; with slightly modified sense applied to the *base* or support of the laver, Ex. 30:18 and repeatedly in P.
- (12) כְּרִיאָה 41:2,4,5,7,18,20 E; all in Hex.
- (13) שֹׁרֶף 41:6,23,27 E; all in Hex.
- (14) פָּעַם (with רִיחַ) 41:8 E; all in Hex.
- (15) רוּיָן HI. 41:14 E; all in Hex.
- (16) שָׁנָה (as verb) 41:32 E; all in Hex.
- (17) נִשָּׂה 41:51 E; all in Hex.
- (18) רָבֵר 41:42 E; all in Hex.

## SECTION XI. GENESIS 42:1-46:34.

## 1. Chapter 42-44.

The critics tell us that ch. 42, which records the first journey of Jacob's sons to Egypt is by E, and chs. 43, 44, their second journey is by J. Yet the second journey implies the first and is filled throughout with numerous and explicit allusions to it. It was, 43:2, after they had eaten up the corn already brought

that their father urged them to go again. All then, turns upon Joseph's having required them to bring Benjamin, vs. 3-11. Repeated reference is made to the money returned in their sacks, vs. 12,15,18-23; 44:8, and to Simeon's detention, vs. 14,23. Jacob's sense of bereavement, v. 14, corresponds with previous statements, 42:36; 37:34,35. Joseph speaks of their father and youngest brother, of whom they had previously told him, vs. 27-29. They bow before him in fulfilment of his dreams, vs. 26,28. Joseph orders their money to be replaced in their sacks, 44:1, as before. And Judah's touching address to Joseph, 44:18-34, recites anew the circumstances of their former visit together with their father's grief at the loss of Joseph. It is difficult to see how two parts of the same narrative could be more closely bound together.

Nevertheless it is maintained that all these allusions to what took place in the former journey are not to the record given of it in ch. 42, but to a quite different narrative; that a careful consideration of chs. 43, 44 will show that they are not the sequel of ch. 42, but of a parallel account by J, which no longer exists indeed, inasmuch as R did not think fit to preserve it, but which can be substantially reconstructed from the hints and intimations in these chapters themselves, and must have varied from that of E in several particulars. R is here as always the scape goat on whose head these incongruities are laid, though no very intelligible reason can be given why he should have constructed this inimitable history in such a disjointed manner. And it is likewise strange that the discrepancies between the two narratives so strenuously urged by Wellhausen and Dillmann seem to have escaped the usually observant eye of Hupfeld, who makes no mention of them. As Ilgen, De Wette and Gramberg had raised the same difficulties before, Hupfeld's silence can only mean that he did not deem them worth repeating. Knobel, though ready enough to undertake a critical division elsewhere, insists upon the unity of chs. 42-45, and maintains that the charge of inconsistencies is unfounded. The same judgment, one would think, must be formed by any candid person. The alleged discrepancies are the following:

1. In J, 43:3, it is Judah, whereas in E, 42:37, it is Reuben, who becomes surety for Benjamin's safe return.

But these do not exclude each other. Why should not more than one of Jacob's sons have sought to influence him in a case of such extreme importance to them all? If Reuben had pleaded without effect, why should not Judah renew the importunity, as the necessity became more urgent? It is here precisely as with the separate proposals of Reuben and Judah, 37:21,26, which, as we have seen, the critics likewise seek, without reason, to array against each other. Reuben's allusion, 42:23, to his interference in that instance implies that his remonstrance was not heeded, and that his brothers were responsible for Joseph's death, which he sought to prevent. As the critics represent the matter this was not the case. At Reuben's instance they put Joseph in a pit instead of shedding his

blood. Now if, as the critics will have it, Midianite merchants found him there and carried him off in the absence of the brothers, the latter had no more to do with his disappearance than Reuben had. Reuben's unresisted charge that the rest were guilty of Joseph's death, in which he was not himself implicated, finds no explanation upon the critics' version of the story. It is only when the sundered parts of the narrative are brought together, and it is allowed to stand in its complete and proper form, that Joseph was sold to the Ishmaelites at the suggestion of Judah, while Reuben supposed him to be still in the pit, that his words have any meaning. No difficulty is created by Reuben's speaking of his blood as required. The brothers imagined him to be no longer living. Judah, who counselled the sale, speaks of him as dead, 44:20. By selling him into bondage, they had as they thought procured his death.

It is further claimed that

2. J knows nothing of Simeon's detention related by E, 42:19,24. Judah nowhere alluded to it in arguing with his father, 43:3-10, when he might have urged the prospect of releasing Simeon as an additional reason for their speedy return; nor does he refer to it in his address to Joseph, 44:18-34.

But the supreme interest on both these occasions centered about Benjamin. Would his father consent to let him go? Would Joseph allow him to return to his father? These were the questions quite apart from the case of Simeon, so that in dealing with them there was no occasion to allude to him. But Simeon is directly spoken of twice in ch. 43. When Jacob is starting them on their return he prays, v. 14, "God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he release unto you *your other brother* and Benjamin." And, v. 23, when they reach the house of Joseph, the steward "brought Simeon out unto them." These explicit allusions to Simeon's imprisonment are evaded by declaring them to be interpolations from E. The argument for suppressing them may be fairly stated thus: because Simeon is not referred to where there is no occasion for speaking of him, therefore the mention which is made of him in the proper place cannot be an integral part of the text. In other words, whatever the critics desire to eliminate from a passage, is eliminated without further ceremony by declaring it spurious. If it does not accord with their theory, that is enough; no other proof is necessary.

The further allegation that 42:38 is not the direct reply to v. 37, because Simeon is not spoken of in it, is futile on its face; for as Reuben makes no allusion to him in his proposal, there is no reason why Jacob should do so in his answer. Nevertheless the critics tell us that E's narrative is abruptly broken off at 42:37 and left incomplete. No response is made to Reuben at all; and we have no means of knowing whether Jacob acceded to his request, or on what terms. Instead of this R introduces an irrelevant verse (v. 38) from J, which in its original connection was a reply to something quite distinct from the words by

which it is here preceded. All this confusion (where in reality no confusion exists) is created by the critical necessity of assigning v. 38 to J since the words "if mischief befall him, ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave" are identical with 44:29,31 and must obviously be from the same writer.

3. "In ch. 42 Joseph will by detaining Simeon, compel the brothers at all events to come back again with or without Benjamin; in ch. 43sq., on the contrary, he forbids them to come back, if Benjamin is not with them. In ch. 42 they are treated as spies, at first they are all put in prison together and then only set free on bail to bring Benjamin, and thus confirm the truth of their declarations; but in ch. 43sq., they do not go back to Egypt from the moral obligation of clearing themselves and releasing Simeon, but wait till the corn is all gone and the famine constrains them. The charge that they were spies was not brought against the brothers at all according to 43:5-7; 44:18sqq.; it was not this which induced them, as in ch. 42, to explain to Joseph, who and whence they really were, and thus involuntarily to make mention of Benjamin, but Joseph directly asked them, Is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? and then commanded them not to come into his presence again without him."\*

All this is only an attempt to create a conflict where there is none. One part of a transaction is set in opposition to another equally belonging to it. One motive is arrayed against another, as though they were incompatible, when both were alike operative. When Joseph told his brothers that they must verify their words by Benjamin's coming or be considered spies, 42:15,16,20,34, he in effect told them that they should not see his face again unless Benjamin was with them. They delay their return until the corn was all used up, because nothing less than imminent starvation will induce Jacob, who has already lost two sons, to risk the loss of his darling. That Joseph directly interrogated them about their father and brother is not expressly said in ch. 42; but as the entire interview is not narrated, there is nothing to forbid it. The critics do not themselves insist on the absolute conformity of related passages unless they have some end to answer by it. The words of Reuben as reported 42:22 are not identical with those ascribed to him 37:22; and nothing is said in ch. 37 of Joseph's beseeching his brothers in the anguish of his soul, as 42:21. Jacob's sons "in rehearsing their experience to their father. . . omit his first proposition to keep all of them but one and their three days' imprisonment, and add that if they prove true, he would offer them the trade of Egypt."† Judah, in relating the words of his father, 44:27-29, does not limit himself to language which, according to 43:2sq., he uttered on the occasion referred to. In these instances the critics find no discrepancies within the limits of the same document but count it sufficient that the general sense is pre-

---

\* Wellhausen, *Comp. d. Hexateuchs*, p. 56.

† VI., p. 15.

served. If they would but interpret with equal candor elsewhere their imaginary difficulties would all melt away.

4. A discrepancy is alleged regarding the money found in the sacks. According to 43:21 J, the discovery was made at the lodging on their way home, but according to 42:35 E, after their arrival home and in the presence of their father.

It is to be observed, however, that these are not variant statements of the historian. In the former passage he is repeating what the brothers said to Joseph's steward, which makes a material difference. The historian's own account of the matter clears up the difficulty entirely. One of the brothers, on opening his sack at the lodging, 42:27sq., found his money and reported the fact to the rest, whereat they were greatly alarmed. But it was not until they emptied their sacks after reaching home, v. 35, that they and their father ascertained to their alarm and to his that each of them had brought his money back. In making their apology subsequently to Joseph's steward, it was of no consequence for them to relate in detail just when and where these successive discoveries were made. The one important fact was that they all found their money in their sacks, and they link this with the first discovery, which so excited them at the lodging. Their statement, though not minutely accurate, was yet for their purpose substantially true.

The critics, however, refuse to accept this obvious explanation. They claim that 42:27,28 does not belong to E's narrative, but has been inserted by R from an assumed parallel account by J. If these verses are excluded from E's text, he makes no mention of any discovery at the lodging. J alone speaks of money being found there; according to E, they first find their money all together at home. It is further alleged, 42:27,28 has been altered by R. In its original form as a part of J's text, it must have corresponded with 43:21, and have stated that not one of the brothers merely but all of them found their money in their sacks at the lodging. If one opened his sack to give his ass provender, must not the rest have done the same and made the same discovery? and especially as they were so agitated by the fact that one had found his money in his sack, would not the rest have made instant search in theirs? But all this conjectural reasoning does not change the fact. The statement of the history is that one found his money at the lodging and all found theirs when they reached home. Whether both these items belong to the same document or not, there is no conflict between them. And the critics can scarcely be accorded the privilege of changing the text *ad libitum* for the sake of creating a discrepancy where there is none and thus manufacturing an argument for variant narratives and separate documents.

An argument is brought from the language of these verses to confirm these critical assertions; but it is altogether inconclusive.

According to Dillmann **האחר** 42:27 means *the first* in order, implying that the rest subsequently did the same; it rather denotes *the one* who performed the action referred to, definitely conceived as 2 Kgs. 6:3,5. It is claimed that the language of these verses is that of J, as shown by **מכפוא**, **מלון**, **אמתחת**. **מכפוא** *fodder* and **מלון** *lodging-place* are the proper words to express these ideas and cannot be regarded as characterizing any particular writer. The former is used four times in the Hex., twice in this narrative, 42:27; 43:24, and twice in the story of Abraham's servant, 24:25,32. The latter also occurs twice in this narrative, 42:27; 43:21, and in two passages besides in the Hex., Ex. 4:24; Josh. 4:3,8. More stress is laid on **אמתחת** *sack*, a word peculiar to this narrative, which is claimed for J, while E's word for the same is **שק**. The latter properly denotes the coarse material from which sacks and the dress of mourners

were made, and is then applied to anything made of this material. **אמתחת** from **מתח** *to expand* is the specific term for a bag or sack. The grain sacks are first mentioned 42:25, where the general term **כלי** *vessel* is used together with **שק**; then in vs. 27,28 **שק** together with **אמתחת**; in v. 35 **שק** alone, and thenceforward **אמתחת** as the proper and specific term is steadfastly adhered to in the rest of the narrative throughout chs. 43 and 44. That this affords no argument for sundering vs. 27,28 from their present connection and assigning them to another writer is obvious, since both **שק** and **אמתחת** occur there together; moreover **אלהים** in the last clause of v. 28 forbids it being assigned to J. Dillmann evades these difficulties by assuming that these verses have been manipulated by R, who inserted **שק** and transposed the unwelcome clause from its original position after v. 35. What cannot a critic prove with the help of R?

Further proof that ch. 42 is from E and chs. 43, 44 from J is sought from the language of these chapters, but with no great success.

E calls Benjamin **יִלָּר** 42:22, but J **נֶעַר** 43:8; 44:22-34. J, however, likewise calls him **יִלָּר** 44:20, and uses the same word repeatedly elsewhere, e. g., 32:23; 33:1-14 (9 times), while E uses **נֶעַר** with equal frequency, 14:24; 21:12-20 (6 times), ch. 22 (5 times), etc., etc.

E says **יַעֲקֹב** 42:1,4,29,36, but J **יִשְׂרָאֵל** 43:6,8, 11. Dillmann undertakes to carry consistently through the rule laid down by Wellhausen,\* but which through the fault of R he admits has not been strictly observed,† viz., that after 35:10 J calls the patriarch Israel, E calls him Jacob, but his sons the sons of Israel, while P continues to speak of Jacob and the sons of Jacob. Whence results this curious circumstance; P 35:10 and E 32:29 (so Dill.) record the change of name to Israel but never use it; J alone makes use of it and he does not record the change at all. There is a singular inconsistency likewise in the conduct of R. P alone mentions the change in the names of Abraham and Saraḥ, 17:5,15, but R is so concerned to have the documents uniform in this respect

that from this point onward he alters these names in J and E to correspond with P; why does he not here in like manner bring P and E into correspondence with J? And it is only by palpable forcing that Dillmann succeeds in uniformly assigning **יִשְׂרָאֵל** to J; see e. g. 45:27,28; 46:1,2; 47:27; 48:2,8,11,21. Wellhausen, Kautzsch and other critics abandon the attempt as hopeless. At this period of transition when the family is branching out into the nation these two names seem to be used interchangeably, the distinction lying purely in the writer's point of view. The patriarch is called by his personal name Jacob when he is regarded strictly as an individual; he is called Israel when he is regarded as the head and representative of the chosen race, cf. 46:8.

E says **שֶׁק**, **אמתחת** for *sack*; explained above.

E says **הָאִישׁ אֲדֹנֵי הָאָרֶץ** 42:30,33; J simply **הָאִישׁ** 43:3,5,6,7,13,14; 44:26. The full phrase "the man, the lord of the land" was necessary at first in order to indicate the person in-

\* *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 59.

† Page 60.

tended; its constant repetition afterwards would be cumbersome. In like manner "the man who was over Joseph's house," 43:16,19 is simply called "the man," v. 17. The plur. const. אֲנִי is used in a singular sense but once besides in the Pent., 39:20, where it is attributed to J.

E has מִשְׁמֶר 42:17,19 as 40:3,4,7; 41:10, while J has בֵּית הַסֹּהֵר 39:20-33; but the latter also occurs in an E context 40:3,5, only the clause containing it is cut out and assigned to J because of this very phrase.

E has the prolonged form of the fem. plur. suf. כְּלָנָה 42:36, as 21:29; 31:6; 41:21; but J has the same יְהִמְנָה for יְחִמֵּן 30:41.

צָדִיק 42:25 E as 45:21; Josh. 9:11; but so J 27:3; Ex. 12:39; all in Hex. except Josh. 1:11 D.

צָרָה 42:21 *bis* E; but so J Deut. 31:17,21; all in Hex.

זָכַר 42:9 E as 40:14 *bis*, 23; 41:9; Ex. 20:8(?), 24; 23:13; but so J Ex. 13:3; 32:13; Lev. 26:42 (three times), 45(?); Num. 11:5; 15:39,40, and P 8:1; 9:15,16; 19:29; 30:22; Ex. 2:24; 6:5; Num. 5:15(?); 10:9(?); all in Pent. except Deut.

אָכַל is claimed for J, 43:2,4,20,22; 44:1,25 in distinction from בָּרַךְ E 41:35,49; 42:3,25; 45:23; but the former occurs in E 41:35 *bis*, 36,48 *bis*; 42:7,10; 47:24 unless the clauses containing it are arbitrarily severed from their context.

יָרַר are said to be used by J of going to Egypt 37:25; 39:1; 43:11,15,20,22; 44:21,23,26, but הִבִּיאַ by E 37:28; but יָרַר is so used in E 42:2,3 and בֹּא in J 42:5; cf. 43:1.

The divine names give no help to the critics in these chapters. אֱלֹהִים occurs once in E 42:18, but three times in J 42:28; 43:29; 44:16 and אֱלֹהֵי שְׂרַי once in a J context 43:14, R is in-

voked to relieve the difficulty in 42:28 and 43:14; while in 43:29; 44:16 the critical principle is abandoned, which traces the occurrence of אֱלֹהִים to the particular document in which it is found, and it is confessed that its employment is due to the distinctive usage of the word itself. אֱלֹהִים is used because Joseph is addressed, who is acting the part of an Egyptian governor. This of course accounts equally for 42:18, where Joseph is the speaker. In 42:28 the implied contrast is between divine and human agency, cf. 4:25. In 43:14 the special appeal is to God's omnipotence.

The attempt to establish a parallel narrative to ch. 42 for J and to chs. 43, 44 for E rests on very slender grounds. Snatches of the former are suspected in 42:2a,4b,6,7,10,27sq.,38, and of the latter in 43:14,23b. 42:2a is alleged to be superfluous beside 1a, which it is not; 4b is given to J because of אָסוֹן and קָרָא, though these are found as well in E; v. 6 because of שְׁלִיט which occurs nowhere else in the Hex., and notwithstanding the plain allusion to Joseph's dreams in the last clause; "he knew them but made himself strange to them" in v. 7 because of the repetition in v. 8, which, however, is for the sake of adding a contrasted thought, and the removal of this clause leaves the following words, "spake roughly unto them," unexplained, so that Dillmann finds it necessary to transpose them after 9a; v. 10 because of אָכַל, though this is equally found in E; vs. 27sq.,38 for reasons already sufficiently discussed; 43:14,23b are cut out of their connection and given to E, because they flatly contradict the critical allegation that J knows nothing of Simeon's imprisonment and that he never says El Shaddai.

## 2. Chapter 45.

This chapter is mainly assigned to E on the ground of alleged discrepancies with what precedes and follows. How, it is said, could Joseph ask, v. 3, whether his father was yet living after his own previous inquiry, 43:27,28, and Judah's speech, 44:18-34, as reported by J? The suggestion only shows how utterly this cold and captious criticism is out of sympathy with the writer and with the whole situation. Joseph's heart is bursting with long suppressed emotion. He had asked about the old man of whom they spake. He can maintain this distance



and reserve no longer. With the disclosure "I am Joseph," his first utterance follows the bent of his affections, "How is my father?"

Again it is objected that Pharaoh had bidden Joseph bring his father with his household to Egypt, promising him the good of the land, 45:17,18; yet, 47:1, Joseph announces their coming to Pharaoh, as though he had never heard of it before; they petition, v. 4, to be allowed to dwell in Goshen, and Pharaoh grants it, v. 6, without any allusion to his previous invitation and promise.

But there is no implication in this last act that the first had not preceded it. All proceeds quite naturally in the narrative. At the first intimation of the presence of Joseph's brethren Pharaoh asks them to Egypt to share the good of the land, assigning them no residence, and only offering subsistence in this time of scarcity. Upon their actual arrival Joseph notifies Pharaoh of the fact and presents his brethren to him with the request that they may dwell in Goshen as best suited to their occupation. And when this is granted he presents his aged father to the king. All is as consistent and natural as possible.

While the grounds of division are thus flimsy, there are various passages in the chapter which are clearly at variance with the hypothesis of the critics, since what they allege to be criteria of distinct documents whether in language or in the contents of the narrative are here inseparably blended. Their only resource here as elsewhere is to interpret these damaging clauses as insertions by R, which they accordingly cut out of their proper connection and assign to J as though they were scraps taken from a supposed parallel narrative of his.

Verse 1a is given to J because of **הַתֹּאפֵק**, only besides in Hex. 43:31 J, but 1b closely connected with it to E because of **הַתּוֹרֵעַ** only besides in O. T. Num. 12:6 E.

Verse 2 is declared superfluous in its connection beside v. 16. But it is not. The action progresses regularly. Joseph's weeping was heard by those outside, v. 2, but the occasion of it became known subsequently, v. 16.

Verse 4b, the sale of Joseph into Egypt is in the wrong document; of course excision is necessary.

Verse 5 is a singular medley; no two successive clauses can be assigned to the same document. The first clause **וַיַּעַזְבוּ** J as 6:6; 34:7; the second, **וַיִּבְעֵי יָכִים**, only besides in O. T. 31:35 E; the third, sale of Joseph J; the fourth, **וְאֱלֹהִים** E.

Verse 7a repeats 5b, but **וְאֱלֹהִים** occurs in both, compelling the critics to give both to E and so confess that repetition is not proof

of a doublet, or else, as Kautzsch proposes, to change one **וְאֱלֹהִים** to **יְחִוָּה** and throw the blame on R.

Verse 10, Joseph's naming Goshen as their place of abode is implied in 46:28 J, where Jacob goes directly thither. It is hence severed from its connection and given to J in whole or in part, while its minute enumeration of particulars is such as is elsewhere held to characterize P in distinction from both J and E.

Verse 13 is assigned to J because of **וְהוֹרִיד** as 39:1, and because it repeats v. 9; so v. 14 because of **וַיִּפֹּל עַל צִוְאוֹרִי** as 33:4; 46:29, while v. 15, a part of the same scene is given to E. Wellhausen by comparison with 33:4 tries to establish a diversity between J and E in the construction of **וַיִּשָּׁק**, a conclusion which Dillmann thinks "weak in its feet."

Verse 28 is the response to v. 27, but one verse has "Jacob" and must be assigned to E, while the other has "Israel" and is given to J.

It is apparent here as in many other cases that the assignment of verses and clauses is simply the enforcement *volens volens* of an arbitrary determination of the critics. No one would dream of sundering these mutually unrelated scraps from the rest of the chapter, with which they are closely connected, but for the application of alleged criteria which the critics have devised in other places in framing their hypothesis. These are carried rigidly through at whatever disturbance of the connection or havoc of the sense, because to abandon them would be to give up the hypothesis. The very least that can be said is that this mincing work, to which the critics find themselves compelled to resort to so great an extent in Genesis and increasingly so in the books that follow, lends no support to the hypothesis, but is simply a dead weight upon it. The hypothesis is plainly not an outgrowth of this and similar chapters, but is obtruded upon them, and the only question is how much lumber of this sort it can carry without signally breaking down.

Elohim occurs four times in this chapter, vs. 5,7,8,9, in the address of Joseph to his brothers. As he is no longer acting the part of an Egyptian, he might have spoken of Yahweh as consulting for the welfare of the chosen race. But Elohim is equally appropriate, since the prominent thought here and throughout the history of Joseph is that it is God not man who guided the course of events, v. 8; 50:20.

### 3. Chapter 46.

Verses 1-5 are assigned to E except 1a which is given to J because of "Israel" and "took his journey" ויסע. This affords an opportunity for creating a discrepancy. Jacob starts in E, v. 5, from Beersheba, in J from some other place, presumably Hebron, 37:14, and takes Beersheba on his way. It scarcely need be stated that the discrepancy is purely the result of the critical partition, and has no existence in the text itself. In v. 2 "Elohim" and "visions of the night," E,\* conflict with "Israel" a mark of J. The difficulty is adjusted by erasing the unwelcome name and tracing its insertion to R.

Verses 6,7 are attributed to P for reasons already considered, VI, p. 191. P's last generally acknowledged statement† is, 37:1, that, in contrast to Esau's removal to Mt. Seir, 36:6-8, Jacob dwelt in the land of Canaan. And yet here follows without a word of explanation the removal of Jacob and his family to Egypt; and it comes out in subsequent incidental allusions that Joseph was already settled there and married into a priestly family, 46:20,27, that he was high in favor with Pharaoh, and it was he who gave his father and his brethren a possession in the land of Egypt, 47:7,11. But how all this came about P does not

\* The repetition of the name and the answer וַיַּעַן as Gen. 22:11; Ex. 3:4 is also claimed for E; but Gen. 22:11 can only be assigned to E by manipulating the text and expunging וַיִּוֶהֱ .

† Two isolated and unexplained statements of Joseph's age, when tending flocks, 37:2, and when standing before Pharaoh, 41:46, are given to P by some critics and denied to him by others.

inform us. The critics are greatly exercised to account for so egregious a gap as this. Kayser suggests that P was theoretical rather than historical; Nöldeke, that R omitted P's account because it was contradictory to E and J; others, because it agreed with theirs. And yet elsewhere R is careful to preserve even the smallest scraps of P, though they are quite superfluous beside the more extended narratives of E or J, e. g., 19:29, and if we may believe the critics he is not deterred by inconsistencies.

The list of Jacob's family, vs. 8-27, is a critical puzzle. It is in the style of other genealogies attributed to P, and has expressions claimed as his, viz., Paddan-aram, v. 15, "souls," vs. 15,18,22,25-27, "came out of his loins," v. 26. And yet it has its doublets in P, Ex. 1:1-5; 6:14-25; Num. 26:5 sqq.; Israel, v. 8, is a mark of J; and, as Kayser affirms, it has too many allusions to J and E to admit of their being explained as interpolations. Thus, v. 12, "Er and Onan, etc.," refers to 38:9 J; v. 18, "Zilpah whom Laban gave to Leah," and v. 25, "Bilhah whom Laban gave unto Rachel" to 29:24,29\* E; vs. 20,27, Joseph's marriage and sons to 41:50-52 E.†

But it is alleged, VI, p. 12, that "P's statistics seem inconsistent with the prophetic stories." This is based on the assumption, which even Wellhausen‡ repels, that every individual person named in the list was born before the migration into Egypt. Such an inference might indeed be drawn from 46:8,26 strictly taken. But to press the letter of such general statements into contradiction with the particulars embraced under them is in violation of the evident meaning of the writer. So 46:15 rigorously interpreted would make Leah to have borne thirty-three children to Jacob in Paddan-aram, one of whom was Jacob himself. Zilpah, v. 18, and Bilhah, v. 25, bare their grandsons as well as their sons. Benjamin is included, 35:24,26, among Jacob's sons born in Paddan-aram, though his birth near Ephrath is recorded but a few verses before. The numerical correspondences of the table, a total of seventy, the descendants of each maid precisely half those of her mistress (Leah 32, Zilpah 16, Rachel 14, Bilhah 7) suggest design and can scarcely be altogether accidental. And a comparison of Num. 26 leads to the belief that regard was had to the subsequent national organization in constructing this table and that its design was to include those descendants of Jacob from whom permanent families or tribal divisions sprang rather than those who chanced to have been born before the descent into Egypt. It need not surprise us, therefore, if we find a few names of those who were still in the loins of their fathers, Heb. 7:9,10, at the time of the migration. It is no departure from the

---

\* It is with the view of quietly evading this difficulty that Wellhausen and Dillmann absurdly sunder these verses from the rest of the chapter and give them to P.

† Also v. 15 Dinah to 30:21, if Kayser and Schrader are correct in referring ch. 34 entire to J.

‡ *Composition d. Hexateuchs*, p. 51: "This list once and again bursts through the historic bounds of Genesis." Critical consistency requires this admission from those who assign 37:2 and 41:46 to P, VI, p. 1, or this document will be in conflict with itself.

usages of Hebrew thought to conceive of unborn children as included in the persons of their parents, 46:4b.

This view of the design and character of the list relieves it of all difficulty that four sons are ascribed to Reuben v. 9, but only two 42:37; that, v. 12, Hezron and Hamul, grandsons of Judah, are included as substitutes for his two deceased sons; and that, v. 21, ten sons of Benjamin are named, though, 43:8; 44:22, etc., he is called נער;\* nor does it matter that some of those who are here spoken of as sons of Benjamin were really his grandsons, Num. 26:40; 1 Chron. 8:3,4.

The divine names in this chapter are grouped together in the opening verses, vs. 1-3. "The God of his father Isaac," v. 1, and "the God of thy father," v. 3, together with the worship at Beersheba are in evident allusion to the altar built there by Isaac and the divine manifestation and promise there made, 26:23-25, though it is at variance with critical theories that E should thus refer back to J. Had God revealed himself, v. 3, as "Yahweh, the God of thy father," it would have seemed eminently appropriate. But "the God of Isaac" is a designation equivalent to Yahweh. And there are special reasons for using the term האל from its association with the name Israel here significantly employed, from its allusion to 35:11, where the promise was given on his return to Canaan, which is now emphatically repeated as he is about to leave it, and from the meaning of האל the *Mighty One* with its assurance, just then specially needed, of omnipotent protection and blessing, and a like assurance is involved in אלהים v. 2, the God of creation and of universal providence.

## 4. LANGUAGE OF P.†

## OLD WORDS.

- (1) רכוש see VI., p. 117. (2) רכש VI., p. 117. (3) וארץ כנען VI., p. 117. (4) ואלה שמות Sect. 7, Lang. of P. (5) פון ארם Sect. 7, Lang. of P.

## 5. LANGUAGE OF J.‡

## OLD WORDS.

- (1) שבר trade in grain, Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (2) קרא meet, befall, 42:38; 49:1 J; 42:4 (so Dill.); Ex. 1:10; 5:3 E; Lev. 10:19 (later additions to) P. קרה Gen. 24:12; 27:20; 44:29; Num. 11:23 J; Gen. 42:29; Ex. 3:18; Num. 23:3 sq., 15 sq. E; Num. 35:11 P. (3) נכר Hi. *recognitze*, Sect. 10, Lang. of J. (4) שאול Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (5) לולא Gen. 43:10 J; לולי Gen. 31:42 E; Deut. 32:27 J, all in Hex. (6) פעם Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (7) אפוא Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (8) אולי Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (9) בתחלה V., p. 151, note. (10) קרר Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (11) נשא עינים Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (12) שים V., p. 154. (13) חלילה Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (14) עתה V., p. 155. (15) נא Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (16) חרה Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (17) עצב V., p. 155. (18) חקנה Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (19) עברך Sect. 6, Lang. of J.

## NEW WORDS.

- (1) אסון 42:38; 44:29 J; 42:4 (so Dill.); Ex. 21:22,23 E.

\* הקטן the *youngest*, 42:13,15, etc., denotes relative not absolute age, and has no reference to size. Rehoboam is called נער *young*, 2 Chron. 13:7, when he was upwards of forty years of age, 12:13. Though Benjamin was tenderly treated as the youngest of the family and Jacob's darling, it must not be inferred that he was still in his boyhood.

† The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 11.

‡ The numbers as VI., p. 14.

- (2) אֶבֶן see above under ch. 42-44.  
 (3) מֶלֶךְ see above under ch. 42-44 (on 42:27,28).  
 (4) טָף 43:8; 47:12,24; 50:8 J; 45:19; 46:5; 50:21; Ex. 10:10,24; 12:37; 32:16,17,24,26 E; Num. 14:3,31; 16:27 JE; Gen. 34:29 R; Num. 31:9,17,18 (later constituents of) P.  
 (5) הַתְּמָהּ 19:16; 43:10; Ex. 12:39 J; all in Hex.  
 (6) זָמֵר 43:11 J; Ex. 15:2 E; all in Hex.  
 (7) כִּי 43:20; 44:18; Ex. 4:10,13; Num. 12:11; Josh. 7:8 J; all in Hex.

## RARE WORDS.

- (1) שְׁלִיט 42:6 J, all in Hex.; "besides only Aram. and in late books, but it may here be a

technical word traditionally preserved, since it agrees remarkably with *Salatis* or *Silitis*, the name of the first ruler of the Hyksos in Egypt," Dillmann.

- (2) קְשׁוּת 42:7 J; 42:30 E; fem. plur. nowhere else.  
 (3) אִמְתַּחַת see under ch. 42-44 (on 42:27,28).  
 (4) יָגוֹן 42:38; 44:31 J; all in Hex.  
 (5) עָרֵב 43:9; 44:32 J; all in Hex.  
 (6) תְּמָה 43:33 J; all in Hex.  
 (7) מִשְׁנָה 43:12 J; all in O. T.  
 (8) מִטְמוֹן 43:23 J; all in Hex.  
 (9) כִּמְר 43:30 J; all in Hex.  
 (10) הַתְּאֵפֶק 43:31; 45:1 J; all in Hex.  
 (11) מִשְׁאֵת 43:34 (three times) J; all in Hex.  
 (12) עֵמֶס 44:13 J; all in Hex.

## 6. LANGUAGE OF E.\*

## OLD WORDS.

- (1) שֶׁבֶר *buy* grain, Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (2) חֶלֶם referred to E by rule. (3) עֶלְכָּן Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (4) יִלֵּד V., p. 164, Lang. of J. (5) אֱלֹהִים explained above. (6) שִׁים V., p. 154, Lang. of J. (7) אֲנָכִי Sect. 5, Lang. of J.

## NEW WORDS.

- (1) מִרְגֵּל 42:9,11,14,16,30,31,34 E; Josh. 2:1; 6:22,23 JE; verb רָגַל Josh. 7:12 *bis* J.  
 (2) מִשְׁמֹר 40:3,4,7; 41:10; 42:17,19 E; Lev. 24:12; Num. 15:34 P; all in Hex.  
 (3) צָרָה see under ch. 42-44.  
 (4) שָׁכַל 31:38; 42:36; 43:14; Ex. 23:26 E; Gen. 27:45 JE; Lev. 26:22; Deut. 32:25 J; all in Hex.  
 (5) נִבְחַל 45:3; Ex. 15:15 E; all in Hex.  
 (6) כִּלְכַּל 45:11; 47:12; 50:21 E; all in Hex.  
 (7) חִוֵּס 45:20 E; all in Hex. except Deut.

- (8) טִיב 45:18,20,23 E; 24:10; Ex. 33:19 J; all in Hex. except Deut.  
 (9) רָגַז 45:24; Ex. 15:14 E; all in Hex. except once in Deut.

## RARE WORDS.

- (1) בָּר 41:35,49; 42:3,25; 45:23 E; all in Hex.  
 (2) בָּנִים 42:11,19,31,33,34 E; all in O. T.  
 (3) בָּחוּן 42:15,16 E; all in Hex.  
 (4) חֵי (in an oath) 42:15,16 E; all in Hex.  
 (5) רַעֲבֹן 42:19,33 E; all in Hex.  
 (6) אֶבֶל 42:21 E; 17:19 P; all in Hex.  
 (7) צָרָה 35:3; 42:21 *bis* E; all in Hex. except Deut.  
 (8) מְלִיץ 42:23 E; all in Hex.  
 (9) צָרוּר 42:35 *bis* E; all in Hex.  
 (10) מַחִיָּה 45:5 E; Lev. 13:10,24 P.  
 (11) טַעֵן 45:17 E; all in O. T.  
 (12) חֲלָפוֹת 45:22 *bis* E; all in Hex.  
 (13) פֹּגַע 45:26 E; all in Hex.

## SEC. 12. 47:1—50:26.

## 1. Chapter 47.

The critics here again try to produce two divergent accounts by their usual method of making the part stand for the whole, and arranging successive incidents against each other as though they were variant reports of the same transaction. Joseph first presents five of his brethren to Pharaoh, that they may state their occupation and have an appropriate residence assigned them. He then pre-

\* The numbers as VI., p. 16.

sents his father *causa honoris* for a formal interview.\* This is all natural enough. But the critics will have it that there was but one presentation, viz., of the brothers, vs. 2sq. J, or of the father, vs. 7-11 P. Then the words "as Pharaoh had commanded," v. 11, with their evident allusion to vs. 5,6, make it necessary to sunder these verses;† vs. 5b,6a are given to P and vs. 2-5a,6b retained for J, whereupon it is urged as the result of this dissection that what J calls, v. 6b, "the land of Goshen" P calls, v. 11, the land of Rameses, though this latter expression occurs but once and is an equivalent designation drawn from the chief city of the district.

Moreover v. 12 must be assigned to E as the fulfilment of the promise, 45:11, though E had not recorded the arrival in Egypt. This deprives the contrasted passage, vs. 13-26, of its proper connection and the difficulty is to find out where it belongs. The criteria of J and E are so intermingled in it that Dillmann thinks it necessary to assume that it was written by J on the basis of a previous narrative by E, which may originally have stood immediately after 41:55, and that it has been worked over by R.‡ Wellhausen takes it to be part of a supposed narrative by J parallel to that of E in ch. 41.

Verse 27b must be assigned to P as it has his characteristic expressions, notwithstanding the fact that it is duplicated by Ex. 1:7 P in violation of the critical rule so urgently enforced elsewhere, and notwithstanding the fact that it must then be severed from 27a, with which it is closely connected, (since "Israel" and "land of Goshen" are marks of J), and attached to v. 11.

The mention of Jacob's age§ and the term of his residence in Egypt, v. 28, is plainly preparatory to vs. 29-31, his charge to Joseph respecting his burial; but as he subsequently gives a like charge to all his sons, 49:29-33, a doublet is once more assumed, and the former given to J, and the latter to P.

Thus a well arranged, well connected narrative is torn to shreds, set at variance with itself, and thrown into confusion for the most trivial and inconclusive reasons.

---

\* The critics say, VI., p. 20, that Jacob as the head of the clan ought to have been presented first. They may settle that matter with the historian, or if they please with R. The sons were the active members of the family, and the reason given in the narrative itself for the order of procedure is sufficient, cf. 34:5,11,13.

† The proposal to substitute the LXX. for the Massoretic text of 47:5,6, VI., p. 19, would certainly not be made by an unbiassed critic. Dillmann's motive in it is obvious enough. The LXX. have here, as so frequently elsewhere, rearranged the text for reasons of their own, which in this instance are quite apparent. In order to bring Pharaoh's answer into more exact correspondence with the request of Joseph's brothers, 6b is made to follow immediately after v. 4, and then a clause is inserted to prepare the way for v. 5.

‡ 47:26 J manifestly alludes to E 41:34. This and many similar facts, e. g., 46:28 J linked to 46:5 E, are consistent with Dillmann's view that J was acquainted with E, but not with that of Wellhausen that they were entirely independent.

§ The inconsistencies charged, VI., p. 20, have already been answered, VI., p. 206.

## 2. Chapter 48.

This chapter fares no better. The continuous narrative of Jacob's blessing the sons of Joseph is parcelled into fragments. "After these things," v. 1, is a mark of E, but as the preceding record is not from E, it is hard to tell what is referred to. "Israel" is a sign of J; 2b must accordingly be cut out from the connection to which it belongs, and be tacked on to the previous chapter. El Shaddai and other critical marks require that vs. 3-7 should be given to P; it thus becomes a disconnected fragment severed from its appropriate introduction and from the rest of the scene, in which it has its proper place. The remainder of the chapter is sadly split up by the alternate recurrence of "Israel," a mark of J, and "Elohim," a mark of E;\* and after all the aid of R has to be invoked to account for Israel in vs. 8,11,21, where the critics themselves shrink from adhering to their own test.

"The composite character of this chapter" is thus argued, VI, p. 25: "(1) 48:1 = 47:29"; but they belong to different occasions. "(2) v. 8 says Israel saw the children of Joseph, while 10a tells us, he could not see"; but if "Israel" is a mark of J, vs. 8,10a and 11 belong to the same document, moreover while he saw Joseph's sons he could not tell who they were. "(3) vs. 15sq. break the story of the crossing of the hands"; they merely complete the statement of Jacob's action before proceeding to say how Joseph interrupted it. "(4) v. 20a = 19"; not so, v. 19 is an explanatory statement to Joseph, v. 20 the formal blessing pronounced upon his sons. The following "differences" are alleged: "(1) according to E, Jacob is *sick* in his last days; not so in J. (2) J alone has the story about Joseph's oath. (3) J alone has the anecdote about the crossing of hands. (4) According to E, Joseph only receives Jacob's blessing, no other of the children, as J gives in ch. 49. (5) Jacob's blindness is known only to J." This simply amounts to saying that if a narrative be divided into two or more parts, one part will not contain what is found in another part.

By the same species of legerdemain Wellhausen and Dillmann claim that 48:22 is at variance with 34:25,26, and in the next breath confess that it agrees with vs. 27-29.

The following divine names occur in this chapter: El Shaddai, v. 3, with allusion to 35:11; Elohim, vs. 9,11,20 with reference to general providential blessings; **האלהים** "the God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God who fed me all my life long," is but a paraphrase of Yahweh; Elohim, v. 21, Jacob dies, but God will be with his descendants.

---

\* Wellhausen, who here shows himself less heroically consistent than Dillmann, gives vs. 3-7 to P, but all the rest of the chapter to E, affirming that it shows everywhere the peculiarities of E and that Israel can no further be considered a mark of J.

## 3. Chapter 49.

49:1-27 is referred to J, not as composed by him, and consequently not on grounds of diction and style, but as a pre-existing writing incorporated in his work, which is inferred from previous allusions to what is here said of Reuben, v. 4, cf. 35:22, and of Simeon and Levi, vs. 5-7, cf. 34:30. It is especially urged that the latter conflicts with 48:22 E, where Jacob says to Joseph, "I have given thee one portion (שָׁכָם) above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow." It is said that Jacob could not have spoken of the capture of Shechem by his sons, which he so severely reprobated, as though it were his own act. This difficulty has been long felt and there have been various attempts at explanation, e. g., that לָקַחְתִּי took was a prophetic preterite (Tuch), or that Shechem is not referred to, but some other district whose capture is not recorded (Kurtz), or that the allusion is to Jacob's purchase, 33:19, which he may subsequently have had to defend by force of arms. Kuenen supposes the same allusion, and proposes to read "not with my sword and with my bow." Josh. 24:32; John 4:5 and the word שָׁכָם show that some transaction at Shechem is referred to. While Jacob deprecated and sharply censured the action of his sons, it nevertheless was the act of the clan of which he was the head; but the property so acquired he gives not to those who participated in the deed, but to Joseph as a mark of special favor, and an earnest of his future inheritance in the land of promise.

The critics try to fix the age of this blessing of Jacob on the assumption that it is a *vaticinium post eventum*. Tuch refers it to the time of Samuel when the tribe of Levi was in ill-repute; Ewald to that of Samson the famous judge from the tribe of Dan, Knobel to the reign of David, Wellhausen to the period of the schism and the rival kingdoms of Judah and Joseph. Dillmann seeks to make it all square with the time of the judges. But the fact is that it is impracticable to find any one period, when this blessing could have been composed with the view of setting forth the existing state of things. The sceptre in Judah found no adequate fulfilment until the reign of David; and from that time forth the consideration enjoyed by the tribe of Levi was such that it could not possibly have been spoken of in the terms here employed. So that Kuenen in despair of finding any one date for the entire blessing supposes it to be made up of brief sayings which circulated in the tribes to which they severally related. But the censures passed upon the first three evidently prepare the way for that of Judah. The prominence given to Judah and Joseph are clearly intentional, not accidental, and several of the blessings would be insignificant or unmeaning, if taken by themselves and disconnected from the rest.

The structure and contents of this blessing make it impossible to explain it as a *vaticinium post eventum*. What is said respecting Levi compels to the



assumption that it is pre-Mosaic. A dispersion resulting from their priestly rank could not after that be spoken of as a sentence for the misdeed of their ancestor. The whole blessing is only comprehensible as utterances of the dying patriarch, modified by personal reminiscences, by insight into the characters of his sons and by their very names, with its ejaculation of pious faith, v. 18; and as a forecasting of the future which found its fulfilment at separate epochs and in unexpected ways, and which, while clear and sharp in a few strongly drawn outlines, is vague in others, and has no such exactness in minute details as suggests actual historical experience.

The mechanical rigor with which Dillmann adheres to the text furnished by the name "Jacob" appears from his sundering v. 1a from its connection and linking it with vs. 28b-33, which is given to P as the alleged doublet of 47:29-31, though this in reality describes a different scene. The emphatic iteration in vs. 29-32 as in the original account of the transaction referred to, ch. 23, shows the stress laid by the writer on this initial acquisition of a permanent possession in the land of Canaan.

The divine names אל and שרי, both suggestive of omnipotence, occur in v. 25; and יהוה in v. 18, where Jacob gives expression to his own pious trust.

#### 4. Chapter 50.

We are told that there are two distinct and varying accounts of Jacob's interment, VI., p. 20, J's vs. 1-11, 14, conducted by Joseph with great pomp and an immense retinue; and P's vs. 12, 13, in which all his sons and no others take part. J's narrative is the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. He gives no account either of the death (49:33 P) or the burial. Joseph goes with a great company to bury his father: he comes back after burying his father; but of the actual burial nothing is said. The only account of that is in the verses that are cut out and assigned to P. Kautzsch finds a doublet in 10b and insists that there are three distinct places of interment representing as many variant narratives, the threshing-floor of Atad, Abel-mizraim, and the cave of Machpelah; only it so happens that this last is the only place at which any burial is spoken of. Joseph's report of his father's language, 50:5, does not precisely correspond with 47:30: but as both passages belong to J, no fresh argument for partition can arise, however it is to be explained.

Verses 15-26 are assigned to E on account of the repeated recurrence of Elohim, notwithstanding the two-fold statement of age, vs. 22, 26, such as is always elsewhere given to P, and two phrases which R is credited with having inserted from J, "spake to their heart," v. 21 as 34:3, and "the land which he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," v. 24; in the passages assigned to E no promise is given of the land of Canaan to any one of the patriarchs. The proof of unity arising from these frequent cross-references from one document to

the other can only be evaded by using the critical knife and invoking the agency of R.

P records the death and the interment; J the embalming, the funeral procession and the return from the grave; E the subsequent apprehensions of Joseph's brothers and his generous treatment of them. And yet these extracts from separate works, as they are said to be, match as perfectly as though they had come from the same pen, and the continuity of the narrative is as accurately preserved.

The divine names are, v. 17, "the God of thy father," which sufficiently identifies the God whom they served, and Elohim, vs. 19, 20, 24, 25, where the contrast is each time that of the human and the divine.

#### 5. LANGUAGE OF P.\*

- (1) ימי שני 47:8, 9, 28, but once beside in Hex. 25:7 P. (2) אֶחָזוּהוּ Sect. 5, Lang. of P. (3) פָּרָה Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (9) פָּרָן Sect. 7, Lang. of P. (10) הָאֶמְקָף אֶל עַם Sect. 7, Lang. of P. (11) לָגוּעַ Sect. 3, Lang. of P (6:17). (12) מִכְפֶּלֶה Sect. 6, Lang. of P.

#### 6. LANGUAGE OF J.

The words attributed to J with scarcely an exception occur also in E.

##### OLD WORDS.

- (1) עֲבָרִין Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also in E). (2) נָם with pers. pron., Sect. 6, Lang. of E. (3) נָם-נָם 24:25, 44; 43:8; 44:16; 46:34; 47:3, 19; 50:9; Deut. 32:25 J; Gen. 32:20; Ex. 12:31, 32; 18:18; Num. 23:25 E; Num. 18:3 P. (4) עֵתָה V., p. 155, repeatedly in J and E, also in P 48:5. (5) נָא Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E and P). (6) שִׁים V., p. 154 (also E and P). (7) מִקְנֶה Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E and P). (8) כָּלֵכֵל Sect. 11, Lang. of E. (9) טָף Sect. 11, Lang. of J (also E and P). (10) שֹׁכֵר *trade* in grain, Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (11) הִבֵּה Sect. 4, Lang. of J (also E). (12) נָהַל Sect. 8, Lang. of J (also E). (13) אֶרְמָה V., p. 153 (also E and P). (14) רָק Sect. 3, Lang. of J (also E). (15) עֵל-כֵּן Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E and P). (16) הֵן 15:3; 27:11; Ex. 5:5; 8:22; Num. 23:9 E; Ex. 6:12, 30; Lev. 10:18, 19; Num. 17:27 P; Num. 31:16 (latest constituents of) P. (17) מִצָּה חֵן Sect. 3, Lang. of J (6:5-8). (18) עֲשֵׂה חֶזֶק Sect. 7, Lang. of J (also E). (19) אֲנֹכִי Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E, once P). (20) שִׁית Sect. 8, Lang. of J (also E, once P (Well.) Ex. 7:23). (21) בַּעֲנִי רֵעַ Sect. 8, Lang. of E. (22) כָּאֵן Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (23) גִּרְלָה Sect. 4, Lang. of J (also E, once P Num. 6:5). (24) קָרָא *happen* Sect. 11, Lang. of J (also E and P). (25) אֵן also E and P Ex. 12:44, 48; Num. 20:6; Josh. 22:31. (26) אֶרֶר also E and P Num. 5:18, 19, 22, 24 bis, 27. (27) קִשָּׁה also E and P. (28) טָרַף Sect. 10, Lang. of J (also E). (29) רִבִּין Sect. 2, Lang. of J (also E). (30) דִּין Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E). (31) אָרַח Sect. 6, Lang. of J (twice in Hex.). (32) כָּרַח 26:25; 50:5 J; Ex. 21:33; Num. 21:18 E. (33) אֶבֶל 50:10, 11 J; 27:41 JE; Deut. 34:8 P all in Hex. (34) יְהוּה explained above. (35) שָׁטַם 49:23 J (not composed by him); 27:41 JE; 50:15 E; all in Hex.

##### NEW WORDS.

- (1) נָצַץ (or נִצָּץ) 30:38; 33:15; 43:9; 47:2 J; Ex. 10:24 E; all in Hex. (2) מָטָה 47:31; Ex. 7:28 J; 48:2; 49:33 cut out of an E and P context and ascribed to J; all in Hex. (3) גִּרְן 50:10, 11 J; Num. 18:27, 30 P; Num. 15:20 S (Dill.), Editor of Lev. 17-26 (Well.); all in Hex. except Deut. (4) תָּמַךְ 48:17 J; Ex. 17:12 E; all in Hex.

\* The numbers are those of VI., p. 19.

† Nos. 27-31 are based on Gen. 49, which was not composed by J and does not represent his diction.

## RARE WORDS.

- (1) מרעה 47:4 J; all in Hex.  
 (2) אָפֶס 47:15,16 J; all in Hex.  
 (3) כָּחַר to conceal 47:18; Josh. 7:19; all in Hex. in this sense.  
 (4) גִּיּוּה 47:17 J; all in Hex.

(5) הָא 47:23 J; all in Hex.

(6) חֲנֹט 50:23 J; 50:26 E; all in Hex.

*"Απαξ λεγόμενα.*

(1) לָהֶה 47:13 J; all in Hex.

(2) יָקָן 48:10 J; all in O. T.

(3) שָׁכַל Pl. 48:14 J; all in O. T.

## 7. LANGUAGE OF E.\*

The words attributed to E with scarcely an exception occur also in J.

- (1) אֱלֹהִים explained above. (2) חֶבֶק Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (3) שָׁם V., p. 154 (Lang. of J). (4) אֲנִי Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (5) שָׁטַם Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (6) נָשָׂא *forgive* Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (7) נָא Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (8) חָשַׁב Sect. 10, Lang. of J. (9) כָּלֵכַל Sect. 11, Lang. of E. (10) נָחַם Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (11) טָף Sect. 11, Lang. of J. (12) דָּבַר עַל לֵב Sect. 9, Lang. of J.

## NEW WORDS.

- (1) שְׁלֵשִׁים 50:23 E; Ex. 34:7 J; Ex. 20:5 JE; Num. 14:18 R; all in Hex. except Deut.

## RARE WORDS.

(1) פָּלַל Pl. 48:11 E; all in Hex.

(2) דָּגַהּ (verb) 48:16 E; all in Hex.

(3) גָּמַל (Qāl) 50:15,17 E; all in Hex.

## CONCLUSION.

We have now completed the critical study of the Book of Genesis and may pause at this point, while we sum up in a few words the results of our investigation. The critics claim that the alternation of divine names in this book is best accounted for by the assumption that Genesis is compiled from different documents, each using its own particular term for God; and when the partition is effected on this basis, each is found to have all the marks of separate authorship, its own peculiar diction and style, its own plan and purpose, and a conception of the history and of religious truth peculiar to itself. How far does the reality correspond with the claim which they make?

The interchange of divine names can, as we have seen, be readily accounted for in every instance from the significance and general biblical usage of the names themselves, while it cannot be brought into harmony with the hypothesis of the critics. In repeated instances Yahweh occurs where by the hypothesis it ought not to be, as 15:1,2; 17:1; 20:18; ch. 22; 28:21, and if Dillmann is right in referring ch. 14 to E, in 14:22. Elohim and El Shaddai also occur in inconvenient places, 4:25; 7:9; 43:14, and require the separation of what is most closely united, as 33:5,11; ch. 48, etc., etc.

In spite of the utmost efforts and the most ingenious devices it is impracticable to make out the continuity of the documents. By dint of picking out available clauses here and there and sundering them from their proper connection a shift is made to carry J along through the flood, and P through the early history of Abraham, R's conduct in preserving these scraps being explained by his reluctance to omit even the most insignificant portion of his sources. But this has to

\* The numbers are those of VI., p. 24.

be abandoned in the lives of Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, where the most enormous gaps confessedly occur in each of the so-called documents. And everywhere in fact it appears that one document implies or expressly alludes to what is stated only in another; so that Dillmann maintains that J made use of E, and Jülicher that P drew upon both J and E; and indeed an unbiased consideration of the facts shows that they are all so closely bound together by mutual references and implications as well as by conformity of plan and purpose, that they cannot by possibility have been independently conceived and written.

In the attempt to establish the separateness of the documents large use is made of what the critics are pleased to consider parallel narratives, but which are not such in fact. Gen. 2 is treated as though it were a second account of the creation, when it is really a sequel to Gen. 1 preliminary to the fall, Gen. 3. God's subjective purpose to send the flood, 6:7, is confounded with his declaration of that purpose to Noah, 6:13, his acceptance of Noah's sacrifice, 8:20-22, with his consequent covenant with Noah, 9:1 sqq., as though these were identical repetitions implying different narrators; and so in numberless instances. Successive parts of the same transaction, or different elements entering into its constitution (e. g., the human and the divine, 30:37 sqq.; 31:7 sqq., or different motives for Jacob's journey, 27:42 sqq., 46, or for the hatred of Joseph, 37:4,8) are converted into variant accounts of the same thing when in fact they are mutually consistent and supplementary. This has been carried by Wellhausen and Dillmann to the utmost extravagance by means of so-called doublets, every emphatic repetition or enlargement being so considered and held to be an indication of some imaginary parallel of which only these occasional snatches survive.

Parallels are further found in totally distinct events, which differ in the actors, times, localities and circumstances, but have some general and easily explained resemblance. The resemblances are first paraded in proof of identity, and then the differences as so many discrepancies in the several accounts. Discrepancies are further multiplied by isolating passages and needlessly interpreting them at variance with their connection, every evidence of consistency being arbitrarily thrown out of the text as a harmonizing addition by R, e. g., 7:7-9; 13:1; 15:7; 16:8-10; 26:1,15; 35:9, etc., etc.

The most capricious and inconsistent conduct is attributed to R, such as is an impeachment of both his honesty and good sense. He is held responsible in fact for everything that is at variance with the requirements of the hypothesis. And on the supposition that such a person really existed and did the work ascribed to him, it is quite impossible to form any intelligent notion of his methods or his aims. We are told that in some places he carefully preserves minute fragments of his sources, though they are a superfluous repetition of what has already been more fully stated in the language of other documents, and yet elsewhere he freely omits large and essential portions of them. In some

places he preserves unchanged what is represented to be plainly antagonistic, while in other places he is careful to smooth away discrepancies, and to give a different turn to variant passages by transpositions or by insertions of his own. He sometimes keeps his documents quite distinct in language and form, at others he effaces their peculiarities or blends them inextricably together. All these offices must be assumed by turns in order to carry the hypothesis safely through; but whether such a bundle of contradictions was ever incarnate in any actually existing person, the only proof of his existence being that these contradictory things are alleged about him, every one may judge for himself.

The diversity of diction and of religious conception, which is claimed for the so-called documents is as fallacious as the other arguments urged in proof of their separate existence. Formidable lists of words and phrases are massed together as the peculium of this or the other document. And the first impression produced by marshalling so vast an array naturally is that this is a very significant circumstance indeed. But it only needs a patient examination of these details with the lexicon and concordance, and a careful scrutiny of their real bearing, to show that they are absolutely devoid of significance for the purpose for which they are adduced.

Words are not to be mechanically counted but intelligently estimated. They are signs of thought; and that the words vary with the thought to be expressed implies no diversity of writers. A writer does not forfeit his identity because he uses words in one place which he has no occasion to employ in another. A very large number of words occur in J and E which are not found in P, and a considerable number in P which are not in J and E; but the reason is obvious. It should be observed at the outset that the words credited by the critics to particular documents require not a little sifting. A thorough examination shows that many of them recur in other documents likewise, or are of very rare occurrence even in that document to which they are assigned, and consequently are either not peculiar to it or not characteristic of it. These are plainly of no moment from any point of view.

But besides this, all that is assigned to P in Genesis, ch. 1-11, apart from genealogies is the creation, 1:1-2:3, and what is regarded as his account of the deluge in chs. 6-9. The great proportion of the words here classed as peculiar to P occur in no other P section of Genesis; then why should it be accounted strange, if they are not found in any section of J? They belong to the description of grand and world-wide events affecting all orders of animated beings; and why should they be expected to recur in narratives of the every-day life of individual men? The terms for God's covenanting with Noah recur when he covenants with Abraham. Those that respect the sex and species of animals recur in the ritual prescriptions dealing with such subjects. But many more technical terms of the ritual are to be found in J, Gen. 1-11, e. g., נפש *soul* (=

person), קדם *east*, זהב *gold*, אבן ישהם *onyx stone*, צלע *rib*, לחם *bread*, עפר *dust*, כתנת *coat*, עור *skin*, כרובים *cherubim*, מנחה *offering*, חלב *fat*, צאן *flock*, נשא פנים *lift up the face* (4:7), חטאת *sin*, פתח *door*, ארר *curse*, עון *bear iniquity*, פני יהוה *face of Yahweh*, אהל *tent*, מקנה *cattle*, העלה *offer*, נחשת *brass*, ברזל *iron*, טהור *clean*, יונה *dove*, זית *olive*, מזבח *altar*, עולה *burnt offering*, ניחח *sweet savour*, יין *wine*, ערוה *nakedness*. This list of words common to the J section of Gen. 1-11 and to the ritual law, and which are not found in the P portion of these chapters and for the most part in none of the sections assigned to P in Genesis, might be yet further increased. It shows, if critical arguments have any value, that the former has as much claim as the latter, or even a greater claim to be regarded as of one piece with the ritual law. The J sections of these chapters really offer more points of contact with the diction of the ritual law than the P sections do. And in respect to the genealogies, it has already been pointed out, V., p. 162, that ch. 5 is as closely bound to chs. 2-4, J, as to ch. 1, P.

In the rest of Genesis, chs. 12-50, two chapters are assigned to P, viz.: chs. 17 and 23, the former recording the institution of circumcision, in which the phrases of the ritual law are to be expected, the latter the purchase of the cave of Machpelah with legal precision and formality. The promises of ch. 17 and the transaction of ch. 23 are repeatedly referred to, and, as is natural, in language borrowed from these chapters. Apart from these chapters and passages based upon them, P is confined to genealogies or brief statements for the most part of the patriarchs' removals, or of their ages or death. The entire narrative portion is given to J, or divided between J and E. Of course the words and phrases appropriate to such matters as are assigned to P are found in P; and such as are appropriate to ordinary narratives are found in J and E. With such a distribution of the material it could not be otherwise. It requires no assumption of a diversity of writers to account for it. In one chapter only, ch. 34, the critics are compelled by the allusion to circumcision to allow P a share in the narrative, and the result is instructive. The diction of P is there indistinguishable from that of J, and the critics are utterly at sea as to the lines of demarcation. It has further been shown that the paragraphs recording the removals of the patriarchs are more closely linked to J than to P; that ch. 17, P, is indissolubly connected with the preceding and following chapters of J, of which it is an indispensable link, and that it owes all its alleged peculiarities to its position in this ascending series; and that the statements of the ages of the patriarchs cannot all be referred to P without doing the utmost violence to the connection. In fact the critics are in the habit of playing fast and loose with a criterion which at times is their sole or chief dependence, and at others is disregarded entirely. While they profess to trace documents in a great measure by the connection of their several parts, they in numerous instances sunder what is most intimately bound together

by necessary implications or express allusions, thus nullifying their own principal clue and invalidating their own conclusions.

The two forms of the divisive hypothesis in chs. 12-50 are tossed on the opposite horns of a dilemma. The supplementary critics, who recognize but one Elohist and accordingly regard E as a part of P, can establish no criteria, by which to distinguish it from J. The documentary critics, who find two Elohistes by separating E from P, leave for the latter only incoherent and unrelated fragments torn from their proper connection, which are without reason assumed to have once constituted a distinct document.

Between J and E scarcely any discrimination is attempted in point of diction beyond יהוה of one and אלהים of the other. The "special characteristics," whether in thought or language, by which E is said to be distinguished from J are considered, V., p. 171, and shown not to be distinctive at all. The alleged theological differences between P and J are also considered, V., p. 182, and shown so far as they actually exist to be involved in the meaning and usage of the divine names. Do not the facts of the case accordingly compel to the conclusion that the divisive hypothesis has no rational basis whatever in the Book of Genesis?

It has been my object throughout this discussion, so far as it has now proceeded, to examine with candor and thoroughness all the arguments in favor of a critical division of Genesis. I feel, as I stated in my first paper, no antecedent repugnance to such a division, if it can be fairly proved and apart from the revolutionary and destructive consequences, which are ordinarily deduced from it. But so far as I can see, the case is not proven. In spite of all the critical clamor, and the scholarly names arrayed on the side of the divisive hypothesis, I see no good ground for abandoning the old traditional belief of the unity of Genesis. And if the divisive hypothesis cannot maintain itself on literary grounds in Genesis, it cannot do so anywhere. In the historical portions of the Pentateuch that follow and in the Book of Joshua the analysis proposed by the critics is far more complicated, and simply amounts to forcing through a hypothesis considered as already established. It very plainly gathers no strength as it proceeds.

In the legislative portion of the Pentateuch the question turns no longer upon literary criteria, but upon an entirely different principle: are the institutions and enactments of the Pentateuch the growth of ages or the product of one age and of a single mind? It is here that the battle of the Mosaic authorship must be fought. Meanwhile the investigations thus far conducted justify at least a negative conclusion. We have examined the so-called anachronisms of the Book of Genesis, and find nothing which militates against its being the work of Moses. It is plainly designed to be introductory to the law. And if that law was given by Moses, as has always been believed and as the Scriptures abundantly declare, then Genesis, too, was his work.